

# The Classical Review

APRIL 1901.

## HOMERICA. (VIII.)

OD. VIII. 352 f. AND THE LENGTHENING OF SHORT VOWELS BEFORE χρ.

θ 352 πῶς ἂν ἐγὼ σε δέοιμι μετ' ἀθανάτοισι  
θεοῖσιν,  
εἰ κεν Ἄρης οἴχοιτο χρέος καὶ δεσμὸν  
ἀλύξας;

ACCORDING to Ameis-Hentze the form χρέος instead of the only well authenticated Homeric χρεῖος has caused La Roche to suggest (*Hom. Unters.*, p. 41) χρέως with monosyllabic scansion as the original reading. The result sounds anything but rhythmical. The equal division of the verse into two separate parts is a device not so richly beautiful as it is fortunately rare. To read the line as a verse at all is rather a trial to the vocal organs, a dangerous delight, not to be indulged in too frequently by the wise and prudent. Hence, if χρέος is as inadmissible as I fully believe it to be, I should prefer to attempt the restoration of the line in this manner:—

εἰ κεν ὃ γ' οἴχοιτο χρεῖος καὶ δεσμὸν ἀλύξας.

The pronominal ὃ γε without further addition is sufficiently lucid here, and yet it might easily have been displaced to make room for the very correct gloss, Ἄρης. Certainly the metrical outcome of this hypothesis need not fear comparison with La Roche's curious effort.

There are one or two interesting points attaching to the examples of χρεῖος in NO. CXXXI. VOL. XV.

Homer, which for the purpose I have in view may be exhibited at length:—

- γ 367 εἴμ' ἔνθα χρεῖός μοι ὀφέλλεται, οὐ τι  
νέον γε—  
Λ 686 τοὺς ἵμεν οἴσι χρεῖος ὀφείλετ' ἐν Ἥλιδι  
δίῃ  
φ 17 ἦλθε μετὰ χρεῖος, τό ρά οἱ πᾶς δῆμος  
ὀφέλλετ'  
θ 355 Ἥφαιστ', εἰ περ γάρ κεν Ἄρης χρεῖος  
ὑπαλύξας—  
Λ 688 δαίτρενον πόλεσιν γὰρ Ἐπε  
ὀφείλον,  
698 καὶ γὰρ τῷ χρεῖος μέγ' ὀφείλετ' ἐν  
Ἥλιδι δίῃ.  
N 746 χρεῖος, ἐπεὶ παρὰ νηυσὶν ἀνὴρ ἄτος  
πολέμοιο—  
α 409 ἦ ἐὼν αὐτοῦ χρεῖος ἐελδόμενος τόδ' ἰκάνει;  
β 45 ἀλλ' ἐμὸν αὐτοῦ χρεῖος, ὃ μοι κακὸν  
ἔμπεσε οἴκῳ.

The odds against χρέος, which is not very likely to find many advocates—it is also impugned by Leo Meyer (*Kuhn's Zeitschr.* VII., p. 208.)—are not, however, quite nine to one, as would seem from the above list. It has the support, whatever it may be worth, of the accepted, but for all that not very trustworthy, reading of λ 479:—

ἦλθον Τευρεσίαο κατὰ χρέος, εἰ τινα βουλὴν  
εἴποι,—

so that in this case as in several others the questionable form exists in duplicate. It would seem as if there had been a deliberate intention not to leave the modernised form entirely without a comrade to keep it in countenance.

But it may be observed that *χρεός* in this latter line departs not only from the quantity of *χρεῖος*, but is used in an uncertain sense. The commentators obligingly give us the choice of three renderings, (1) 'on business with,' (2) 'in need of,' (3) 'for consultation with.' To add to the difficulty the identical expression *κατὰ χρεός* actually occurs in the 'Hymn to Hermes,' l. 138 :—

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τοι πάντα κατὰ χρεός ἤνυσε δαίμων,

where it evidently means 'duly,' 'in due course,' and contributes nothing to the elucidation of the usage in the Homeric passage.

I would suggest, as the only possible solution short of absolute surrender to *χρεός*, that in λ 479 the original must have been subjected to some slight alteration, and might previously have run thus :—

ἦλθον Τειρεσίαο κατὰ κλέος—

This is a little different from the usual *μετὰ κλέος*, but this difference would correspond to a difference in the sense of the expression. He came not 'in quest of,' 'to find,' the fame of Teiresias, cf. Δ 227 *μετὰ κλέος ἵκετ' Ἀχαιῶν*, but 'because of his fame,' 'along of,' as we say in provincial English of the North.

So much then for the validity of *χρεός* in Homer. I must now return to θ 353. The lengthening of the *o* of οἶχοιτο before *χρεῖος* in my proposed emendation will not be objected to in face of γ 367 εἰμ', εἵθα *χρεῖος*, φ 17 ἦλθε *μετὰ χρεῖος*, where the 'production' is that of a syllable in arsis.

With regard to Δ 686 τοὺς ἔμην οἷσι *χρεῖος* the case is different, and I have a suggestion to make, which, if well founded, is of some importance in the sphere of metrical usage. The *ι* of οἷσι being here in thesis, the better reading would be, as I judge, οἷσιν *χρεῖος*. In fact I venture to maintain that, other means failing, the *ν* ἐφέλκυστικόν is a necessity here; for although *χρ* would always suffice to lengthen a preceding short vowel in arsis—of this there are examples in plenty—it would be quite a different matter if the vowel were in thesis. Then I submit this vowel would remain short, as in the well-known instances Ψ 186 :

ροδόντι δὲ χρίον ἐλαίῳ—.

Ω 795 καὶ τὰ γε χρυσεῖν ἐς λάρνακα θῆκαν ἐλόντες.

Accordingly I should not regard the traditional reading of θ 353 as metrically open to any valid objection any more than Hym. Apoll. 293 :—

πᾶσι θεμστεύοιμι χρέων ἐνὶ πτόνι νηῶ.

On the other hand La Roche's reconstruction of θ 353 in this light becomes worse than ever: but let it rest in peace. Why stretch the corpse, and such a lovely corpse, again upon the rack?

I proceed to add to the passages already adduced Hym. Herm. 332 :—

σπουδαῖον τόδε χρῆμα θεῶν μεθ' ὁμήγουριν ἦλθε

and one of a unique, but very suggestive, character from the Hymn to Apollo l. 439 :—

ἐς λυμέν', ἣ δ' ἀμάθοισιν ἐχρίμψατο ποντοπόρος νηῦς.

Now I do not claim to have absolutely proved by these instances the canon I have ventured to lay down, but the probability of its truth is at least considerably strengthened thereby, and may derive still further confirmation and support both (1) from examples of its applicability to improve existing rhythms and (2) from the facility, with which such adverse examples as occur in the vulgate may be corrected.

(1) I will begin by referring to α 409 and the very similar β 45, quoted above in the list of instances of the use of *χρεῖος*. The primitive and more acceptable rhythm in these lines may fairly be supposed to have been :—

ἦ ἐὼν αὐτόο *χρεῖος*—  
ἀλλ' ἐμὸν αὐτόο *χρεῖος*—.

In ρ 121 ὅττεν *χρηίζων* at the beginning of the line is clearly improved by the restoration of the dactyl ὅττεο. No advocacy is here required. None shall be used.

And so probably enough in Δ 686, although, as I have said, οἷσιν would be at least correct, yet something might be advanced both on grounds of sense and rhythm in favour of :—

τοὺς ἔμην, οἷσί τι *χρεῖος* ὀφείλετ' ἐν Ἡλιδι δῆν.

In Α 37, 451, perhaps I may not be alone in preferring to the vulgate this emendation :—

κλυθὶ μιν, ἀργυρότοξος, ὃ Χρύσην ἀμφιβέβηκας.

For the nom. for voc. v. *Cobet. Misc. Crit.* p. 333, Monro H. G. § 164 and for the article used as relative pronoun v. Monro H. G. § 262.

I expect less ready support and approval for my next suggestion, on the analogy of Hym. Apoll. 439, quoted above, that a 13 :—

τὸν δ' οἶον νόστου κεχρημένον ἥδ' ἐ γυναικός,

may have had originally, as the second hand in U (Monacensis Augustanus) gives it,

νόστοιο κεχρημένον,

while the very similar, but even more cumbersome *andante* movement of ν 378 σίτου καὶ οἶνον κεχρημένον, would certainly be infinitely improved in lightness, harmony and rhythm, if read :—

σίτοιο καὶ οἶνοιο κεχρημένον—.

(2) The adverse instances of lengthening of a short vowel in thesis before χρ are neither numerous nor formidable. In ν 215 we now read :—

ἄλλ' ἄγε δὴ τὰ χρήματ' ἀριθμήσω καὶ ἴδωμαι.

For this I have elsewhere (*Journ. Phil.* xxvii, p. 172), without any idea that the second foot was really illegitimate, proposed to restore :—

ἄλλ' ἄγε δὴ τὰδε χρήματ' ἀριθμήσω τε ἴδω τε.

I need not dwell on the un-epic character of the article here. The hitherto unsuspected fact that it is also unmetrical, merely confirms the general opinion which already condemns, and has long condemned, τὰ χρήματα as a late depravation, though the terrors of χρ seem to have prevented any suggestion of the above easy remedy.

ν 263 ἀλλὰ χρήματα μὲν μυχῶ ἄντρον  
θεσπισίοιο  
θεύμεν αὐτίκα νῦν—

The tradition here has not been altogether fallacious, for in four reasonably good MSS. PHTU (Ludwich) may be found the true reading ἄλλ' ἄγε instead of ἀλλά FGDSLW.

ξ 385 πολλὰ χρήματ' ἄγοντα σὺν ἀντιθέοις  
ἐτάροις

Here again the MSS. in three instances at any rate, GLW, indicate an unexceptional reading :—

πολλὰ κτήματ'

This is to some extent confirmed by the analogous case of ν 120, where the accepted text has ἐκ δὲ κτήματ', though a minority of MSS., already started on a wrong tack, has χρήματα there also (κτήματ' FGPDSU; χρήματ' MLW, Eust.) Ludwich.

There remains, I believe, but one other instance of this lengthening in thesis :—

π 185 ἥδ' ἐ χρύσεια δῶρα τετυγμένα

Here the MSS. render no assistance towards a restoration; but the subjoined is not a very far-fetched remedy, nor one from which the vulgate could not be developed with tolerable facility :—

ἥδ' ἔτι χρύσεια δῶρα

ἥδ' ἔτι would be read ἥδέ τι, and then the meaningless τι would of course drop out altogether. Compare ξ 173, where although ὄφρα τι is in no wise meaningless, yet I am distinctly of opinion that Homer said ὄφρ' ἔτι, in spite of the recurrence of ἔτι in the next line. Such recurrences are not uncommon in Homer.

I now pass for a moment to the consideration of θ 355 :—

"Ἡφαίστ', εἴ περ γάρ κεν Ἄρης χρεῖος ὑπαλύξας.

On the principle I have endeavoured to establish, the intolerable ending -ος ὑπαλύξας, now defended on grounds, which carry no conviction, but cannot well be discussed at present, may be easily redeemed by a simple emendation :—

"Ἡφαίστ', εἴ περ γάρ κεν Ἄρης ὑπὸ χρεῖος ἀλύξας.

In conclusion I cannot but remark on the curious inconvenience of the duplicate set of verb forms exhibited in the lines, on which I have been commenting, ὀφέλλεται, ὀφείλον, ὀφείλετο contrasted with ὀφέλλεται, ὀφέλλε. The inconvenience is enhanced, when we have to find room for another ὀφέλλω, αὐγεο, which has obviously no connection with the above double-barreled eccentricity. It must not be supposed that the variation of spelling in the verb that signifies 'I owe' is a point of absolute differentiation between the Iliad and Odyssey, as might appear to be the case from these lines. So far as can be ascertained, the authority of Aristarchus (v. on A 688) seems to have largely prevailed in the Iliad in favour of the spelling -ελλ-; but -ελλ- is not by any means absent from the older poem, as may be easily seen. In fact we have in the Iliad pretty much the same

elegant confusion as in the *Odyssey*. If the latter gives us γ 367 *χρεῖός μοι ὀφέλλεται* (*debetur*) and ξ 233 *αἶψα δὲ οἶκος ὀφέλλετο* (*augebatur*), the former is a good second with:—

A 353 *τιμὴν περ μοι ὀφελὼν Ὀλύμπιος ἐγ-  
γαλίζαι* (*debebat*)

Υ 242 *Ζεὺς δ' ἀρετὴν ἀνδρεσσιν ὀφέλλει τε  
μινύθει τε* (*auget*).

In this difficulty are we to throw Aristarchus overboard or to accept his pilotage and allow him to guide us into smoother waters? I leave the question unanswered for more experienced seamen to tackle. Non omnia possumus omnes. T. L. AGAR.

ON ARISTOTLE'S *POETICS*, CH. VIII. 1451<sup>a</sup> 22 sqq.

ὁ δ' Ὅμηρος ὥσπερ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα διαφέρει καὶ τοῦτ' ἔοικεν καλῶς ἰδεῖν, ἥτοι διὰ τέχνην ἢ διὰ φύσιν. Ὀδύσσειαν γὰρ ποιῶν οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἅπαντα ὅσα αὐτῷ συνέβη, οἷον πληγῆναι μὲν ἐν τῷ Παρνασσῷ μανῆναι δὲ προσποιήσασθαι ἐν τῷ ἄγερμῳ, ὧν οὐδὲν θατέρου γενομένου ἀναγκαῖον ἦν <ῆ> εἰκὸς θάτερον γενέσθαι, ἀλλὰ περὶ μίαν πρᾶξιν οἷαν λέγομεν τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν συνέστησεν ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἰλιάδα.

My attention was directed to the difficulties of this passage by an interesting paper upon several places in the *Poetics* and other Aristotelian writings, recently read before the Oxford Philological Society by Mr. J. A. Smith of Balliol College.

There appear to be two main views on the interpretation. The first is that the words οἷον πληγῆναι μὲν ἐν τῷ Παρνασσῷ μανῆναι δὲ προσποιήσασθαι ἐν τῷ ἄγερμῳ give examples of what Homer left out, and this may well seem at first sight the natural explanation. But then the *Odyssey* does contain the first incident. Robortello meets this difficulty by supposing, apparently, that οὐκ ἐποίησεν means 'did not describe at length,' on the ground that the wounding by the wild boar is only briefly alluded to (uno tantum atque altero verbo exposuit).<sup>1</sup> Some modern scholars, since the incident is really described at length, interpret οὐκ ἐποίησεν rather as amounting to 'did not embody in his poem as a part of the main subject,' or something similar. The other view is that by a brachylogy, which does not seem altogether impossible, πληγῆναι μὲν κ.τ.λ. is given as an example corresponding to ποιῶν and μανῆναι δὲ κ.τ.λ. as one corresponding to οὐκ ἐποίησεν. The scholars who maintain this view are well aware that it has its difficulties, but feel compelled to it by the fact that the first incident is really mentioned in the poem; and think they find some confirmation in

the following clause ὧν οὐδὲν θατέρου κ.τ.λ., which seems to indicate a discrimination between the two incidents. It is rather against their ingenious interpretation that Aristotle is fond of pointing such an antithesis as they suppose by an emphatic αὖ following the second member of it: but the main thing is that the supporters of neither view have considered sufficiently the great difficulty in which both sides are involved by the next clause ὧν οὐδὲν θατέρου γενομένου ἀναγκαῖον ἦν ἢ εἰκὸς θάτερον γενέσθαι. On the second view, as we have said, the clause would allege a ground for discriminating between the two incidents. The sense then would be 'Homer put in the first incident but omitted the second, because neither of these incidents involved the other.' This would be very awkward logic. The reason for preferring one to the other could not lie in the mere fact that neither involved the other; it would have to be that the first suited the plan of the poem: and then also the reason for rejecting the second must be, not that it was disconnected with the first, but that it had not the characteristic which justified the admission of the first, that is to say that it was not connected with the story.

On the first view the sense would be:— 'Homer embodied neither incident in his main subject because neither involved the other.' But that two incidents should be unconnected can be no reason for excluding both from the main subject; one of them may be connected with it and if the rule were carried out every incident would be eliminated from a poem. Thus, whether we suppose Aristotle intended to say that the first event was put in and the second left out, or that both were left out, the clause ὧν οὐδὲν κ.τ.λ. seems to cause insuperable difficulties. Only if neither of these alternatives, which have been taken to be the only possible ones, was true would these difficulties disappear.

<sup>1</sup> I owe this reference to Mr. A. O. Prickard.



And this really seems to be the solution: there is another alternative.

What is here said of the procedure in the *Odyssey* is an illustration of a principle laid down at the beginning of the chapter, which Homer, Aristotle says, understood (τοῦτ' ἰοικεν καλῶς ἰδεῖν):—1451<sup>a</sup> 16, μῦθος δ' ἐστὶν εἰς οὐχ ὥσπερ τινὲς οἴονται ἐν περὶ ἑνα ἧ' πολλὰ γὰρ καὶ ἄπειρα τῷ ἐνὶ συμβαίνειν, ἐξ ὧν [ἐνίων] οὐδέν ἐστιν ἓν· οὕτως δὲ καὶ πράξεις ἐνὸς πολλαὶ εἰσιν, ἐξ ὧν μία οὐδεμία γίνεται πρᾶξις. 'A story is not a unity, as some people fancy, because it is about one person, for innumerable things happen to one person out of which no unity can be made' etc.

So here, in our passage, Aristotle says 'Homer, when composing a poem about one man, Odysseus, nevertheless did not put in it everything which happened to his hero, [for, as said above, things happened to him which could not be combined into a unity,—συνέβη ἐξ ὧν οὐδέν ἐστιν ἓν] for instance it happened to him (συνέβη) on the one hand that he was wounded on Parnassus, and on the other hand that he pretended to be mad, neither of which events had any necessary or probable connection with the other' [and so could not be combined in the same unity.]

Thus in the clause οἷον πλεγγῆναι κ.τ.λ., with which συνέβη must be understood, Aristotle does not assert either that Homer put in the first event and omitted the

second, or that he omitted both; but only gives them as examples of incidents which could not be combined into a unity, examples therefore which shew that Homer could not put in everything alike which happened to Odysseus (οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἅπαντα ὅσα αὐτῷ συνέβη) because they are such that he could not put in both. And that is all. It is not said how, exactly, the poet treated the incidents, e.g. which of them he left out, and it would make no difference to Aristotle's point if neither had happened to occur in the poem.

The sense then is shortly 'Homer who appreciated (καλῶς εἶδε) the principle above laid down, did not put in his poem everything which happened to his hero: for example here are two incidents, which have no conceivable connection with one another etc. [which could not therefore be combined into a unity; so that, according to our principle, one or other must be left out.]'

The logical and grammatical difficulties would thus seem to disappear.

It may be added that the words ἀναγκαῖον ἢ εἰκός are emphatic. The expression 'no necessary or probable connection' comes very near our phrase 'no conceivable connection.' The emphasis is very appropriate on the interpretation here suggested, but on the other interpretations seems rather lacking in point.

J. COOK WILSON.

#### NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE PARIAN MARBLE.—I.

In revising the text of the Parian Marble with a view to a new edition I have hit upon certain supplements and corrections, which I publish at once, partly at the instance of Dr. Hiller von Gaertringen, who is preparing the inscriptions of Paros for the *Corpus Insularum*, partly in the hope of drawing suggestions from other scholars.

The text naturally falls into three parts corresponding to the three fragments of the stone. The first fragment, lines 1 to 45, disappeared<sup>1</sup> in the seventeenth century, and its text is known to us only from Selden's edition in his *Marmora Arundelliana*.

<sup>1</sup> Prideaux says in his preface that this fragment was used to repair a fireplace in Arundel House, presumably a marble chimney-piece. If so, it may yet be recovered, for such a piece of furniture would be likely to be removed entire, and the slab may have been made into a panel or shelf and still retain the inscription on its inner face.

*ana*, 1628 and 1629. The second is now in the University Galleries at Oxford, but has suffered so much from exposure and neglect that the text is in many places better preserved in the earlier editions than on the stone. The third fragment was discovered about four years ago in Paros, and remains in the local museum at Paroikia, where I have collated it.

This last portion has been excellently edited by Crispi and Wilhelm in *Mittheilungen des Instituts, Athenische Abtheilung*, xxii. 1897, pp. 183-217. For the rest Boeckh's great edition in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, vol. ii. no. 2374, is the standard. It is the foundation on which all later editors have built, and enjoys such unquestioned acceptance that even in scholarly works Boeckh's restorations are commonly quoted as if they had the

authority of the Marble itself. Boeckh has indeed done more for the restoration and interpretation of the text than anyone since Selden, and more than anyone will ever be able to do again. But his edition has not the finality which has sometimes been attributed to it. Perhaps no edition can ever be final, for the reconstruction of the text is a very difficult matter. In some places the inscription has been so extensively mutilated that no supplement can be more than a happy divination. The size and closeness of the writing vary so much that one line may contain 30 letters more than another. Selden's text (as Palmerius long ago demonstrated) does not always preserve the spaces of the original, his gaps are only very roughly measured, and his dots seldom represent, and do not seem to be meant to represent, the number of letters missing. It is not surprising that even Boeckh's wide learning and wonderful sagacity are sometimes at fault. But his edition is still beyond all comparison the best hitherto published, and the bulk of his work need never be done again. I take my start from Boeckh's achievements, and discuss only points in which I think that his text can still be mended.

## I.

*Ep. 4. Lines 6-8.* 'Αφ' οὗ κατακλυσμός ἐπὶ Δευκαλίωνος ἐγένετο, καὶ Δευκαλίων τοὺς || ὄμβρους ἔφυνεν ἐν Λυκωρείας εἰς Ἀθήνας πρὸς Κραναῖον, καὶ ΤΟΥΔΙΟ . . . ΥΟ . . . Δ . . . Μ ΤΟΥΤΟΙΡ . . . ΟΝΙΔ . . . . . Ο . . . τὰ σωτήρια ἔθυσεν, || [ε]τη ΧΗΗΠΔΓ, βασιλεύοντος Ἀθηνῶν Κρ[α]ν[α]ίου.

Boeckh restores τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ὀμβρίου 'Απ[η]μ[ι]ον τὸ ἱρὸν ἰδρύσας[ο] [καί], comparing Pausanias i. 32, 2, ἔστι δὲ ἐν τῇ Πάρνηθι καὶ ἄλλος βωμός, θύουσι δὲ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ τότε μὲν Ὀμβρίον τότε δὲ Ἀπ[η]μίον καλοῦντες Δία. But the altar on Parnes is not here to the point, and Boeckh's attempt to treat seriously Selden's spaces and dots breaks down. Probably Selden copied first what was obvious and afterwards what was difficult, but his gaps proved too wide and his supplements were badly adjusted. It is better to revert to Chandler's restoration, based on Prideaux, τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου [π]ι[ον] τὸ [ε]ρὸν ἰδρύσας[ο] [καί]. Cf. Paus. i. 18, 8, τοῦ δὲ Ὀλυμπίου Διὸς Δευκαλίωνα οἰκοδομῆσαι λέγουσι τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἱερόν. On ἱερόν not ἱρὸν see Wilhelm's observations in Ath. Mitth. xxii. p. 199.

*Ep. 5. Lines 8-10.* 'Αφ' οὗ Ἀμφικτύων Δευκαλίωνος ἐβασίλευσεν ἐν Θερμοπύλαις, καὶ συνῆγε || [τ]οὺς περὶ ΤΟΝΟΡΟΝ οἰκούντας καὶ ὠνόμασεν Ἀμφικτύονας κ.τ.λ.

Wilhelm (l.c.) convincingly argues that for τὸν ὄρον we ought to read ΤΟΙΕΡΟΝ, τὸ ἱερόν.

*Ep. 7. Lines 12-13.* 'Αφ' οὗ Κάδμος ὁ Ἀγρήγορος εἰς Θήβας ἀφίκετο [καί] ἔκτισεν τὴν Καδμεΐ- || -αν, ἔτη κ.τ.λ.

Palmerius supplied κατὰ χρησμόν with reference to the oracle about the cow. Boeckh suggested ἐκ Φοινίκης comparing lines 14-5, ἐξ Αἰγύπτου εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἔπλευσε. (Cf. also Herod. ii. 49, παρὰ Κάδμου τε τοῦ Τυρίου καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ ἐκ Φοινίκης ἀπικομένων ἐς τὴν νῦν Βοιωτίαν καλεομένην χώραν cf. v. 57). Flach justly observes that the order of words in lines 14-5 is different and tells against Boeckh's suggestion. (Cf. also line 7, above, and line 51 Σαπφώ ἐν Μυτιλήνης εἰς Σικελίαν ἔπλευσε.) Flach conjectures τῆς Βοιωτίας, which is flat, and supported neither by Herodotus nor by the practice of the Marble. Perhaps, as the line seems a little too short, κατ' Εὐρώπης ζήτησιν might stand. This phrase, or its equivalent, is so frequent in connection with Cadmus, that it suggests that either one chapter of the Cadmean legend was known as 'the quest of Europa,' or some poem, which was a favourite authority for the legend, bore that title. Cf. Herod. iv. 147, Diod. Sic. v. 48 and 58, Ap. Rhod. iii. 1178, Apollod. iii. 1, Schol. Eurip. Phoen. 638, Syncell. p. 306 (Bonn), etc., and the Δήμητρος ζήτησις attributed to Orpheus in line 26 below.

*Ep. 8. Lines 13-14.* 'Αφ' οὗ [ ] νικής ἐβασίλευσαν, ἔτη κ.τ.λ.

Boeckh justly suspects that the lacuna is too small in Selden's text. He is clearly right in preferring Lydiat's Λακωνικής to Selden's Φοινίκης, but I cannot follow him in accepting the supplement Εὐρώτας καὶ Λακεδαίμων. It is neither recorded nor probable that Eurotas reigned simultaneously with his son-in-law<sup>1</sup> Lacedaemon, and neither of them has a strong claim to be mentioned.

I conjecture 'Αφ' οὗ [Σπαρτοῖ, μετὰ Κάδμου] ἐπεσόντες, Λακωνικής ἐβασίλευσαν, or something to that effect. The suggestion is based on the proximity of Cadmus in space and

<sup>1</sup> Lydiat does not prove his statement that Eurotas and Lacedaemon were sometimes regarded as brothers. Steph. Byz. s.v. ταύγετον only shows that Taygete might be made the mother of either.

time (Ep. 7, three years earlier, cf. Eusebius (Schoene) Ann. Abr. 696 and 700) and the words *Λακωνικῆς ἐβασίλευσαν*. The Sparti furnish not only a link between these two terms, but also an explanation of the name Sparta, which would be quite in the manner of this part of the chronicle, cf. *Κεκροπία*, 'Ακτική, 'Αρειος πάγος, 'Αμφικτύονες, 'Ελληνες, Καδμεία, πεντηκόντορος, κ.τ.λ. On the Sparti in Laconia, cf. Steph. Byz. *Σπάρτη*, *Λακωνικὸν χωρίον, ἀπὸ τῶν μετὰ Κάδμου Σπαρτῶν, περὶ ὧν Τιμαγόρας φησὶν ἐκπεσόντας δὲ αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν Λακωνικὴν Σπάρτην ἀφ' ἐαυτῶν ὀνομάσαι*.

The Aegeidae, φυλὴ μεγάλη ἐν Σπάρτῃ (Herod. iv. 149), were sometimes derived from these immigrant Sparti (e.g. Schol. Pind. Pyth. v. 101, Tzetzes, Lyc. 495). Theras, whom Herodotus regards as the grandfather of Aegeus, was a Cadmean, and *ἐπιτροπαίην εἶχε τὴν ἐν Σπάρτῃ βασιληίην* (Herod. iv. 147). One Admetus, priest of the Carnean Apollo in Thera, and so presumably an Aegeid, boasts his descent *Λακεδαιμόνος ἐκ βασιλῆων* in a pair of inscriptions of Roman date, C.I.G.I., iii. 868-9. These royal pretensions may be put beside the *ἐβασίλευσαν* of the chronicle.

Possibly Plato's fondness for the myth of Cadmus and his earth-born warriors may be connected with his interest in Sparta.

Ep. 9. Lines 14-17. In line 16 certain of the daughters of Danaus ἀποκληροθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν [ἱερὸν ἰδρύσ]αν[ο 'Αθηνᾶς] || καὶ ἔθυσαν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀκτῆς ἐμ. ΠΑΡΑ . . ΑΔΙ ἐν Λίνδῳ τῆς Ποδιάς.

On ΠΑΡΑ . . ΑΔΙ Selden adds in his note (p. 74) 'Ex elementorum, quae supersunt in Marmore, vestigiis elicerit forsitan quis ΠΑΡΑΡΑΔΙ aut ΠΑΡΑΓΑΔΙ.' Since therefore Selden evidently paid some attention to this word Boeckh's remark 'pro infaustis aliorum conatibus certam dedi emendationem ἐμ παράπλω' must be pronounced reckless. I had long decided that παρα[στ]άδι must be the right reading, when I was astonished to find it lurking unheeded in Palmerius' commentary. The editors seem to have wholly ignored this convincing suggestion, and perpetuated only Palmerius' impossible alternative παρα[λι]άδι. For ἐμ παραστάδι compare the formula so common in the inscriptions of Iasus, C.I.G. ii. 2672 *ἡγῃ, ἀναγράφαι εἰς παραστάδα, ὃ ἐν τῇ παραστάδι τῇ πρὸ τοῦ ἀρχείου*.

Line 16 is obviously too short, but it is difficult to decide how to fill it out. The whole subject of the Danaids at Lindus needs clearing up.

At the beginning of line 16, among the names of the Danaids, Selden gives . . ΛΑΡΕΥΩ. To one who knows the stone the obvious emendation is ΚΑΛΛΙΣΤΩ, and just as Archedice does not occur elsewhere among the Danaids, so Καλλιστῶ may perhaps be admitted. Καλλιδική is found in Apollodorus, whose list differs widely from Hyginus'.

Ep. 10. Lines 17-21. Among other events Hyagnis the Phrygian invented flutes [καὶ ἁρμονίαν τὴν κ]α||λουμένην Φρυγιστὶ πρῶτος ἠύλησε καὶ ἄλλους νόμους Μητρὸς, Διονύσου, Πανός, καὶ τὸν ἐπ[

It should be noticed that the νόμοι are all associated with a particular deity. Boeckh's restoration τὸν ἐπ[ι Πυθῶνι ἐπικύρδειον Λυδιστὶ], cf. Plut. de Mus. 15, is the only one which entirely harmonizes with the series, and although he does not print it in his cursive version, its appropriateness seems to me to outweigh the fact that this νόμος was attributed by Aristoxenus to Olympus. Perhaps τῶι Πυθῶνι (as in Plutarch) would, as Flach observes, be an improvement; and I should omit Λυδιστὶ, which is at least unnecessary after ἄλλους νόμους, and to my mind a little out of tune with the rest of the passage.

Ep. 11. Lines 21-23. καὶ 'Ακμονος, the name of the third Dactyl, inserted by Boeckh, makes the line rather long. Palmerius and Prideaux more prudently restricted themselves to two, especially as the discovery of iron is elsewhere actually ascribed to Kelmis and Damnameneus without Aemon, v. Clem. Alex. Strom. i. 75.

Ep. 12. Lines 23-24. 'Αφ' οὗ Δημήτηρ ἀφικομένη εἰς 'Αθήνας καρπὸν ἐφύ[τε]ν, καὶ ΠΡ . . . . ΠΡΑ . . . . ΩΤΗ δ[ε]ῖξαντος || Τ]ριπτολέμου τοῦ Κελειοῦ καὶ Νεαίρας, ἔτη ΧΗΔΔΔΔΓ[ι], βασιλεύοντος 'Αθηνῆσιν 'Εριχθέως.

Boeckh restored πρ[ό]πειρα ἐ]πρά[χθη] πρ[ώ]τη, but evidently felt some misgivings as to the conjunction of the first two of these words. With great confidence I suggest προηροσία ἐ]πρά[χθη] πρ[ώ]τη. Cf. Hesych. προηροσία: τὰ πρὸ τοῦ ἁρότου (ἁρότρον cod.) θύματα: Suidas προηροσίαι αἱ πρὸ τοῦ ἁρότου (ἁρότρον cod.) γινόμεναι θυσίαι. On the whole festival and its relation to Demeter and Eleusis, see A. Mommsen, *Heortologie*.

Boeckh writes δεζάντων, but it is more likely that Neaera is meant to be the mother of Triptolemus than his helper. Many different mothers are assigned to him.

I have added | to the numeral to distinguish this *epoch* from the next, for nowhere in the chronicle are two *epochs* dated at the same year. Boeckh adopts Lydiat's expedient, and reads || for Π in Ep. 13. But it is obviously better to set the ploughing and sowing in close connection in consecutive years. This point has some bearing on the question of the season from which the chronicler reckons his years.

Ep. 14. Lines 25-27. [Ἀφ' οὗ Ὁρφεὺς Οἰάγρον]|| νῖδ[ς τῇ]ν αὐτοῦ πο[ί]ησιν ἐξ[ί]θῃκε, Κόρης τε ἀρπαγὴν καὶ Διμήτηρος ζήτησιν καὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ [ ]θος τῶν ὑποδεξαμένων τὸν καρπὸν κ.τ.λ. One would expect τὴν αὐτοῦ εἰς αἶδου κατάβασιν (see Boeckh's note), but Selden's copy has τόν. Boeckh therefore restored καταβαθμόν, but quotes no parallel for this rather odd use of the word. Perhaps, in view of the prominence of water in the Orphic pictures of the nether world, κατάπλους might be used. Cf. e.g. Hermesianax in Athenaeus xiii. 597, ἔπλευσεν δὲ κακὸν καὶ ἀπεχθία χώρον κ.τ.λ.

For the latter half of the *lacuna* Boeckh's first idea was τὸ θείον πάθος, and it seems to me happier than his second thought τὸ γῆθος. I would add to it ἐκεῖ, for which there is room enough, to make the meaning clear and precise.

The whole passage will then run—καὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ [εἰς αἶδου κατάπλουν καὶ τὸ θείον|| ἐκεῖ πᾶ]θος τῶν ὑποδεξαμένων τὸν καρπὸν. On the general sense consult Boeckh's admirable note.

In line 26 Selden has πόσιν both in his uncial and in his cursive text, and Boeckh retains it. But, without reckoning ἱαμβοποιος and the like words, ποιητῆς or ποιήσις occur 16 times in the extant portions of the chronicle, and ἐποίησεν once. The omission of the *iota* here seems more likely to be due to Selden than to the author.

Ep. 16. Lines 29-30. Ἀφ' οὗ καθαρυμὸς πρῶτον ἐγένετο . . . . ΟΥΓΡΩΤΩΙΑΟΝ . . . EANT . . . . || [ἐτη Χ<sup>α</sup>]ΔΙΙ, βασιλεύοντος Πανδίωνος τοῦ Κέρκωπος.

None of the conjectures hitherto proposed are satisfactory. Boeckh, partly following the lead of his predecessors, writes [φόν]ον, πρώτω[ν] Ἀ[θηναίων καθήρ]αν[των] Ἡρακλῆα. I would suggest [Μελάμπος] πρώ[του] Πρ[οίτου] [δω]ν [παύ]αν[τος τὴν μανίαν], which is nearer to the copy than it looks at first sight, and still leaves the line rather a short one. Cf. Eusebius Ann. Abr. 642

and 649 (Arm.), 647 and 650 (Hieron.), where Melampus follows in the next note after Eumolpus (cf. Ep. 15); and especially Apollodorus ii. 2, 2, 4, Μελάμπος δὲ . . . . μάντις ὢν καὶ τὴν διὰ φαρμάκων καὶ καθαρμῶν θεραπείαν πρῶτος εὐρηκὼς ἐπισχεῖται θεραπείᾳ τὰς παρθένους κ.τ.λ. The letters EANT point to -σ[αντ]ος rather than καθήρ[αντ]ος, and παύ[αντ]ος fits the space better than θεραπει[αντ]ος. Cf. Alexis in Athenaeus viii. 340, ὁ Μελάμπος, ὃς μόνος τὰς Προϊτίδας ἔπασσε μαινομένης: Schol. Eur. Phoen. 181, ἐπλανῶντο ἀνὰ τὴν χώραν ἐς ὃν Μελάμπος ὁ Ἀμυνθάνος ἔπασσε σφᾶς τῆς νόσον: Steph. Byz. Δουσοί: ὅπου Μελάμπος ἔλουσε τὰς Προΐτον θυγατέρας, καὶ ἔπασσε τῆς μανίας.

There is great diversity in the dates assigned to Melampus and Proetus, v. Clinton, Fast. Hell. i. p. 74. The restoration of the numeral here is due to Lydiat, who acutely observed that no other number ending in ΔΙΙ could fall within the reign of Pandion II.

Ep. 17. Lines 30-32. Ἀφ' οὗ [ἐν] Ἐλευσίνι ὁ γυμνικός. . . . . ΑΦΟΥ. . . . || . . . ΑΙ . . . τὰ Λύκαια ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ ἐγένετο, καὶ Α . . . ΚΚΕ . . . . Λυκάονος ἐδόθησαν. . τοῖς Ἑλλ[λη]σί[ν] ἐτ[ῇ] κ.τ.λ.

There can be no doubt that ἀγὼν ἐτέθη must follow γυμνικός, but ΑΦΟΥ is difficult, for considerations of space absolutely preclude us from starting a fresh *epoch* here, as was done by some of the earlier commentators. Boeckh ingeniously conjectured Κ[Α]Ι[Ο]Υ[ΣΙΑ] βρέφους ἀνθρώπου κ[αὶ], (cf. Paus. viii. 2), but the double subject θυσία καὶ τὰ Λύκαια scarcely suits ἐγένετο, and the position of ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ is very awkward. Ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ ought to answer to ἐν Ἐλευσίνι, and everything before καὶ τὰ Λύκαια ought to be connected with Eleusis, not with Arcadia. A passage in the Hymn to Demeter, lines 263-7, has suggested to me the restoration ἐπὶ Τ[Α]Φ[Ω]Ι Δημοφῶντος τοῦ Κελεῶ, κ[αὶ], which at least illustrates the sort of supplement required.

For the second *lacuna* Boeckh considered [αἱ ἐ]κκ[η]ρύξεις τοῦ Λυκάονος a certain restoration, which he interpreted 'de praeconiibus novos ludos per Graeciam nuntiantibus.' Müller justly objected to the unknown word ἐκκ[η]ρύξεις and substituted ἐκεχειρία, which is accepted by Flach. But neither word quite fits ἐδόθησαν, and both ideas are mere weak developments of the preceding clause. This is the right place for a reference to the human sacrifices which



formed part of the Lycaean festival and were ascribed to the institution of Lycaon. Part of a human victim was chopped up with the flesh of the other animals sacrificed, and served out to the communicants. Whoever at this ghastly sacrament chanced to eat of the human flesh was supposed to become a wolf. [Αἰ] κ[ρ]ε[ανομία] Λυκάονος seems to me to give the right expression, and to suit the vestiges well enough, for Κ is written narrow with short tails, so that ΚΡ might easily be misread as ΚΚ.

It is difficult to say whether the space for two letters [εν] before τοῖς Ἕλλησιν is deliberate or casual. There is a similar gap between καὶ and τὰ Λύκαια, and such maladjustments are bound to occur in a copy gradually puzzled out—a bit here and a bit there and a bit between. But ἐν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν would rather gain by my restoration, for the insertion of ἐν emphasizes the un-Hellenic character of the practice. Cf. Plato, *Minos*, 315 C, καὶ μὴ ὅτι βάρβαροι ἄνθρωποι ἡμῶν ἄλλοις νόμοις χρώνται, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ ἐν τῇ Λυκαίᾳ οὔτοι καὶ οἱ τοῦ Ἀθάμαντος ἔργοι οἷας θυσίας θύουσιν Ἕλληνες ὄντες.

Ep. 20. Lines 34–36. 'Αφ' οὗ Θησ[εὺς βασιλεύων] || Ἀθηνῶν τὰς δώδεκα πόλεις εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ συνώκισεν καὶ πολιτείας καὶ τὴν δημοκρατίαν ΑΠΡΕΩ . . . . || . . . . ΟΣ Ἀθηνῶν τὸν τῶν Ἰσθμίων ἀγῶνα ἔθηκε Σίνιν ἀποκτείνας, κ.τ.λ.

Boeckh gives ἀπ[έδ]ω[κε, καὶ ἀπογενόμενος] Ἀθηνῶν. Ἀπέδωκε seems certain, but ἀπογενόμενος is a little colourless. On the other hand Gutschmid's ἐκὼν ἀπαλασσόμενος (why present?), quoted by Flach, is unnecessarily emphatic, although the words τὴν δημοκρατίαν ἀπέδωκε point to a voluntary abdication, cf. Plutarch, *Thes.* 24 and 25. Perhaps μεταστὰς αὐτὸς would hit the mean without missing the antithesis.

Ep. 22. Lines 37–38. I much prefer Boeckh's suggestion ἐπ' Ἀρχεμώρῳ τὸ τῷ Δι, which he prints. It is much more like the chronicle to give the occasion, cf. Σίνιν ἀποκτείνας above, ἐλόντες Κυρῆαν in Ep. 37, and there is no real lack of space, for the lines are long (that is to say closely written) in this part of the inscription.

Ep. 25. Lines 40–41. 'Αφ' οὗ Ὀρέστη[ς] . . . ΙΟΙΑΙΤΩΝΑΥΤΟ . . . . [Α]γιόθου θυγατρὶ [Ἡριγ]όν[η] ὑπὲρ Αἰγίσθου, καὶ αἰ[τοῖς] ἡ δέ || -κη ἐδικ[ά]σθη ἐν Ἀρεί[ῳ] πύγῳ, ἣν Ὀρέστης ἐνίκησεν [ἴσων γενομένων] τῶν ψήφων, ἐτη [ῤ]ΗΗΗΗΔΔΔ[ΔΙ]Η, βασιλεύοντος Ἀθηνῶν Δημοφῶντος.

Boeckh restored Ὀρέστη[ς] πρ[ο]σ[τα]ταῶν αὐτ[ο]ῦ δίκην ὑπέσχετο κ.τ.λ., but did not satisfy himself. Perhaps Ὀρέστη[ς] ἐπὶ προνομίᾳ τῶν αὐτοχειρῶν ἐδικάσθη might stand in default of a better suggestion. It does not quite convince me, but it has the advantages of keeping all the letters of Selden's copy and giving a sense more pertinent to the case. Not all αὐτοχειρίαι were judged by the court of Areopagus, but only αὐτοχειρίαι ἐκ προνομίας, v. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 57, cf. Plato, *Laws ix.* esp. 865 B, c, 871 A.

ἴσων γενομένων is more natural than Boeckh's ἰσοθεισῶν. In both lines I allow more letters than Boeckh, but keep well within the number preserved in several complete lines.

In the numeral Boeckh supplies ΠΙΙ, but since it is impossible to conform the number to Homer, *Od.* iii. 304–8, I think that the first year of Demophon's reign is the date most probably intended.

Ep. 26. Lines 41–42. 'Αφ' οὗ [Σαλα-|| μίνα ἐγ] Κύπρῳ Τεύκρος ὠκισεν, κ.τ.λ.

The editors restore ἐν Κύπρῳ, but compare ἐγ Κυβέλοις and ἐγ Κελαιναῖς (line 19), ἐγ Κυζίκῳ and ἐγ Κῳί (lines 14 and 23 of the new fragment), ἐγ Γέλαι (line 74, clearly ΕΓ on the stone). The exception ἐν Γάζει (lines 19–20 of the new fragment) is to be explained by the fact that the two words come in different lines.

Ep. 27. Lines 42–44. 'Αφ' οὗ Νη[λ]ᾶ[ς] εὖς ὠκισ[ε] Μάλητον κ.τ.λ., ἐτ[η] [ῤ]ΗΗΗΔΔΙΙ, βασιλεύοντος Ἀθηνῶν ΜΕΝΕΣΘΩΣ ΤΡΕΙΣ-ΚΑΙΔΕΚΑΤΟΥ [ΕΤΟ]ΥΣ.

Selden's uncial text has ΝΕ . . . ΕΥΣ, but in his table of *errata* and his cursive version he corrects ΝΕ to ΝΗ. Boeckh puts the correction aside as a conjecture, but I see no valid reason for rejecting it. The Ionicisms in the text of the Marble have now almost disappeared (εἰς is merely in the heading), so that Νηλεὺς seems more probable than Νελεὺς.

More important is the question of the date. Selden in his cursive version and notes tacitly corrects Μενεσθῶς to Μενεσθῆως, which may be accepted as the reading of the Marble. He is evidently inclined to believe<sup>1</sup> that the words Μενεσθῆως τρεῖςκαὶδεκάτου ἔτους have simply been repeated from line 39 by a blunder of the engraver, and would substitute for them Μέδοντος or Ἀκάστου. Μέδοντος is both epigraphically

<sup>1</sup> Palmerius positively and confidently adopts this theory.



and historically the more probable correction. But perhaps Selden goes too far in rejecting altogether *τρεῖςκαίδεκάτου έτους*. The precise date assigned to the foundation of Syracuse in the reign of Aeschylus (Ep. 31) creates a presumption in favour of a precise date in the reign of Medon for the Ionic colonization. Moreover the engraver could hardly have made the mistake, or at least must surely have detected it, if something like *τρεῖςκαίδεκάτου έτους* had not intervened between the king's name and the 'Αφ' οἷ which opens the next *epoch*. But if Selden's correction *Μέδορτος*, and his restoration of the numeral 813, be accepted, as surely they must be, then *τρεῖςκαίδεκάτου έτους* can hardly be retained as it stands. For if we may assume that the Marble continues to agree with Eusebius' Canon in the lengths of the reigns (although putting them all 26 years earlier), 813 will be the 19th year of Medon. The only other possible number is 823, which would be equally inconsistent with *τρεῖςκαίδεκάτου*. Boeckh attempts to reconcile the 13th year of Medon with the numeral 813 by adopting Dodwell's suggestion that the chronicler agreed with the Excerptor Barbarus, and not with Eusebius' Canon, in reckoning the years of the reigns between Menestheus and Medon. But there still remains a difference of one

year, which he tries to adjust by his untenable doctrine of the double *computus*. We may, however, find a middle course between Boeckh and Selden. It will be enough to account for the stone-cutter's blunder if the beginning and end of our restoration resemble those of *Μευσθῆως τρεῖςκαίδεκάτου έτους*. Now there is no evidence that the Marble is not consistently 26 years behind Eusebius down to the date of Pheidon in Ep. 30. We may therefore legitimately argue that the date 813 carries with it the restoration *Μέδορτος έννεακαίδεκάτου έτους*. If the engraver slipped from *Me* into *Meυσθῆως*, he may well have followed up the false cue and written *τρεῖς*- (as in line 39) for *έννεα*-, and yet have been prevented by the final *-καίδεκάτου έτους*, which is common to both phrases, from ever detecting his aberration.

It is worth noting that the two slips, Medon 13 for Medon 19, and Menestheus 2 for Menestheus 22 (Ep. 24), would, if taken seriously, throw the historical reckoning 26 years back on the numerical, and that this is precisely the interval by which the Marble differs from the Canon of Eusebius. Possibly it may not after all be the engraver who is to blame.

J. ARTHUR R. MUNRO.

(To be continued.)

## TWO EPIGRAMS OF MARTIAL.

### LIB. SPECT. XXI.

Quidquid in Orpheo Rhodope spectasse  
theatro

dicitur, exhibuit, Caesar, harena tibi.  
reperunt scopuli mirandaque silus cucurrit,  
quale fuisse nemo creditur Hesperidum.  
affuit inmixtum pecori genus omne ferarum  
et supra uatem multa pependit auis.

ipse sed ingrato iacuit laceratus ab urso.

haec tamen res est facta ita pictoria.

The story of Orpheus and his lute was enacted in the amphitheatre; the stones and trees, the beasts and birds were there, all spell-bound by his music; but the show ended with a novelty: Orpheus was killed by a bear. The last verse appears as above in the best and oldest manuscript H; T amends the metre somewhat,

haec tamen haec res est facta ita pictoria;

most of the MSS have larger alterations,

haec tamen ut res est facta, ita ficta alia;  
and Schneidewin proposed and Friedlaender and Gilbert accept

haec tamen, haec res est facta ita, ficta prior,  
'yet this, this circumstance was so performed, the earlier was feigned': *res prior*, I suppose, is the accepted tale of Orpheus' death. The antithesis has no point, the emphasis of the repeated *haec* is mere ineptitude, and *tamen*, so far as I can see, means nothing at all; for there is no sort of contrast between verse 7 and verse 8, between being killed by a bear and being really and truly killed by a bear.

Mr Buecheler has recognised that the Latin letters ICTORIA at the end of the verse are the Greek word *ιστροπία*. But he

gets no profit out of this discovery: he writes

haec tamen, haec res est facta, τὰς ἰστροπία, explains ἰστροπία as *res gesta*, 'das vor Zeugen urkundlich dokumentirte' (ἰστροπία being glossed as *θέα* in the Byzantine lexicons), and leaves *haec haec* just as aimless and *tamen* just as senseless as before.

I propose to write

haec tantum res est facta τὰς ἰστροπίας.

ITAPICTORIA = ἸΑΠΙCΤΟΡΙΑ ('lineola significans v frequentissime occurrit iis in uocibus, quae in fine uersuum scriptae sunt' Bast comm. pal. p. 747). For IT=Π see Porson on Eur. Phoen. 1277: add a good example from M. Sen. suas. vi 21 εἰ τιράφιον for ἰστροπία. Since *tū* could signify either *tantum* or *tamen*, these two words are incessantly exchanged: thus at ix 46 4, the MSS are divided between them. The behaviour of T in attempting to cure the metre with *tamen haec* is repeated at i 3 5, where H has 'maiores nusquam runt' for *rhonci* and T expands it to *fuertunt*. In lib. spect. 22 4 'sed tandem rediit' some MSS have *tamen* and then others make matters worse with *tamen huic* and *tamen is*.

The sense wants no explaining, 'in this detail alone did the performance diverge from the story.'

#### XXI B

Orphea quod subito tellus emisit hiatu  
uersam is amur uenit ab Eurydice.

So H, with a letter erased between *uersam* and *is* says Schneidewin, between *is* and *amur* too says Friedlaender. T makes this into *uersa miramur*, the editors all build on the falsified reading, and their structures are worthy of their foundation. The conjectures of Haupt, Munro (accepted by Friedlaender) and Gilbert are virtually identical in meaning, but Haupt's is nearest to the MSS:

Orphea quod subito tellus emisit hiatu,  
mersa (miramur ?) uenit ab Eurydice.

Who was so ignorant as to wonder or think of wondering at the spectacle of Orpheus emerging from underground, exactly as Orpheus would be expected to do? And who, that did wonder at this spectacle, would cease to wonder on being told that Orpheus came from Eurydice, from whom he was most unwilling to come? I do not know that I can more clearly and briefly display the absurdity of these lections than by saying that they would acquire some sense and

point if we made the following changes in the proper names: 'Socratem quod tellus emisit, miramur ? uenit a Xanthippe.'

So put *uersa miramur* aside, and from *uersam is amur* elicit

Orphea quod subito tellus emisit hiatu  
ursam mersuram, uenit ab Eurydice.

*ursam-e-rs-ur-am* makes *u-rsam-rs-am-ur*. For this leap of *e* over four letters compare Plaut. mil. 604 si rescuere, scire siuere, Liu. xxii 14 3 extrema iuga Massici, extremam iuga assici, xli 21 3 Claudio sine, cladio suine; the transposition *ur-am, am-ur* I have illustrated in this *Review* vol. iii p. 201 and in the Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society vol. iii p. 146: here I will only add Liu. xiv 34 11 'uer primum ex domo exciuiat, iamque Synnada peruenerant,' where the editors write *exciuit*, but *exci-ui-ta-t* should perhaps be *exci-ta-uit-t*.

This is the same bear that we met in the former epigram: it has changed its gender for the sake of grammatical lucidity, much as the *uulidi leones* of Lucr. v 1310 become *leae* to suit the metre in 1318. 'As for the earth opening and sending forth a bear to drag down Orpheus, the creature was Eurydice's emissary': she sent it that her husband might rejoin her in the shades. *hiatu* is to be supplied a second time with *mersuram*, 'tellus subito hiatu emisit ursam eodem hiatu Orphea mersuram': the bear came out of a fissure in the ground, and disappeared into it again, dragging the body of Orpheus after her ('mergere hiatu' Aetna 119, 'ad infernam Styga | tenebrasque mergis' Sen. Thy. 1008). It may seem that *ursam* and *Orphea* should change places, but I suppose Orpheus stands at the beginning to match Eurydice at the end. The use of *quod*, so frequent in prose, recurs in Martial at ii 11 1-6, viii 21 4, 82 2. In this connexion let me cite and explain the hexameter sors C.I.L. i 1453, which is not fully apprehended either by Munro at Lucr. iv 885 or by Mr Buecheler in his anthologia epigraphica.

quod fugis, quod iactas tibi quod datur,  
spernere noli.

The third *quod* is the relative pronoun, the two others belong to the class of which I am speaking: quod fugis iactasque (= fastidis) eam rem quae tibi datur, noli donum spernere, 'as for your refusing and disdaining what is given you, I bid you despise it not.'

A. E. HOUSMAN.

## THE CODEX TORNAESIANUS OF NONIUS MARCELLUS.

For the text of Book IV of Nonius Marcellus, a book which is in size equivalent to a third of the whole work, the Geneva MS. (*Gen.*) is probably the best authority; better even than the famous Leyden MS. (*L.*). With *Gen.* are associated in one family or group the Berne MS. (*B.*) and the first hand of the Cambridge MS. (*Cant.*<sup>1</sup>) and of the Harleian MS. (*H*<sup>1</sup>).

In this year's volume of the *Philologus* I have, I trust, proved that *Cant.*<sup>1</sup> and *H*<sup>1</sup> are nothing but copies of *Gen.*, so that the only existing independent representative of the group, besides *Gen.*, is *B.* Now *B.* is a MS. which omits at random passage after passage, so that its testimony is as often wanting as not. And further its text shews clear signs of arbitrary emendation and alteration. *B.* is therefore not of much use as a check on *Gen.* Where *Gen.* exhibits a unique reading, we do not get much help from *B.* in deciding whether this reading has come from the archetype or is merely an error of the scribe.

Considerable interest therefore attaches to the readings of the lost MS., which was once in the possession of Dutournes (Tornaesius), and whose text must have stood in close relation to the text of *Gen.* They were found in the margin of an edition of Nonius belonging to Schneidewin, who had transcribed them from another edition belonging to Duebner. Duebner himself had taken them from the marginalia of a printed text. Here is Prof. Mueller's account of them in the second volume of his edition of Nonius (p. 307):

'Porro similis admodum Genevensis libri fuit Tornaesianus, excepto quod mancum fuisse probabile est. Ex eo dittographias paucas inveni adiectas margini editionis Basiliensis nuper a me emptae, quae olim fuerat Iacobi Beckeri. Is acceperat a Schneidewino, professore quondam Gotingensi, qui descriperat ex Duebneri exemplari Merceriano. Cf. comm. doctor. Gotting. a. 1843 p. ii. pg. 700 sq. Nec vero Duebnerus ipso usus est codice, sed ex editione quadam transcripsit quae dixi. Pertinent excerpta illa ab initio capitis iv. ad 314, 19.'

For readings removed by so many stages from the actual MS. of Tornaesius complete accuracy could hardly be claimed. In 280 M. 27, for example, where our Nonius MSS. have *Appia*, it was difficult to believe that

the Codex Tornaesianus not merely had *Appio* but placed the word in the preceding line after the word *exercitu*. Fuller and more direct information regarding the lost codex was highly desirable.

In the margins of a Plantin edition of Nonius (Antwerp, 1565, 8vo.) in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris (with shelf-mark Rés. X. 1, 788) I have just found what appears to be a careful and fairly complete collation of this codex. The book belonged to Cl. Dupuy (Claudius Puteanus) and has been used solely for the collation of a MS. which contained only Book IV. No account of the MS. is given; but in another copy of the same Plantin edition, which belonged to the same owner (Rés. X. 1, 786), this collation has been entered along with other marginalia and is distinguished from them by the symbol 'vet. cod. Torn.' (e.g. p. 269 im.), 'Tor. v.c.', or (usually) 'To.' This transcription<sup>1</sup> is not always perfectly accurate. For instance, at

266 M. 17, where the original has *pergamera sic* (i.e. *pergam era* had in the codex been corrected to *pergam eri*), the transcription has *To. pergameri sic*. But since the binder of the original volume has often cut ruthlessly through the marginalia, the help of the transcript is very welcome.

An examination of the readings ascribed to this 'vet. cod. Torn.' destroys the hope of fresh light being thrown on the text of the fourth book of Nonius. For the codex appears to have been nothing else than the Geneva MS. itself. In the passage just quoted the Geneva MS. has precisely this correction of *pergam era* to *pergam eri*. In 353 M. 34-35 after *verum ea necessitudo* in the text, the collation gives *Necessitudo necessitas*. *Sall. in Catil. praeterea necessitudo* with the appended note 'haec addita sunt manu alia, sed antiqua tamen,' corres-

<sup>1</sup> There is in the same library (Rés. x. 1, 791) another copy of Nonius (Paris, 1583, 8vo.), whose marginalia come from this volume. At the end stands this entry in the handwriting, I think, of P. Pithou the younger: 'Emendavi Lutetiae ex libro v. cl. Claudii Puteani MDCXII kal. Mart.' The fact that no less than three copies of the readings of so important a MS. should have remained undiscovered emphasises anew the necessity for catalogues of all those early editions of the Classics which are provided with marginalia. The Cambridge University Library has long had a printed catalogue of this kind; the Bodleian now possesses a written one. It is to be hoped that other libraries will follow their example.

ponding with the state of the passage in the Geneva MS., where *Gen.*<sup>3</sup> has added the words which other MSS. of Nonius omit. In 296 M. 44 all MSS. of Nonius offer *induat*, and so does *Gen.*; but in *Gen.* the word is so written as to resemble *inducit*. The newly found collation has *inducit*. Coincidences like these can hardly be accidental. Where the readings of the Codex Tornaesianus, as given by Mueller, differ from the readings of *Gen.*, the collation effaces the difference. It shews e.g., in 280 M. 27 *appia* (at its normal place in the text) with the appended note 'f(ortasse) *ab Appio*. vide historiam annorum u. c. 676 et 681.' Similarly:

232, 30 *qua*, not *quanta*

234, 7 *studos ualem*, not *s. suavem*

234, 9 *meridonibus*, not *mier*.

13 *ne quid animas emittat*, not *amittat*,

and so on. One by one, all the discrepant readings of the Codex Tornaesianus vanish as we go through the collation. And when we consider how much nearer to the actual MS. is the collation made by a contemporary, Dupuy, than the marginalia of Schneidewin, and how every new transcription brings new opportunities for error, we can hardly claim that the variants in Schneidewin's list are strong enough testimony of the existence of a second 'codex Tornaesianus,' connected, but not identical with the Geneva MS.

W. M. LINDSAY.

#### PROHIBITIVES IN TERENCE.

A RECENT reading of the *Phormio* with an undergraduate class increased my scepticism as to the validity of Elmer's theory of the force of tenses in the prohibitive in Early Latin. To satisfy myself, I reread the remaining plays twice. The results were so at variance with Elmer's statistics and conclusions that I venture to present them here.

Elmer, in his first article on the prohibitive (*A.J.P.* xv, 142-146), cites 24 examples of the four types he is considering, *ne* with the perfect and present subjunctive and *cave* with the same tenses. Bennett gives practically the same figures (*Cornell Studies* ix, 48, note) when he says: 'Terence has a total of fewer than 25 instances of these four types.' I have noted 14 additional instances, (all in the present tense), and 7 instances of *vide* (*ne*). It is interesting to note that half of the 14 examples 'are accompanied by other expressions which betray the speaker's earnestness, e.g. *per deos atque homines, obsecro, hercle*, etc.' (Elmer, p. 140, when arguing in favour of his interpretation of the force of the perfect).

The only satisfactory way in which to prove the truth or falsity of Elmer's theory is to subject it to the 'fair test' which he himself suggests. He says: 'Ask in connection with each prohibition the question, 'Will a failure to comply with the prohibition result in a disaster of some sort to one's

interests or feelings? You will find that in prohibitions with the present tense the answer will be 'No' almost without exception. In prohibitions with the perfect, the answer will be 'Yes' in most cases.'

#### 'NE' WITH THE PERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE.

There are but two instances, both from the *Phormio*: 514, *Si tum non dederō, unam praeterea horam ne oppertus sis* (Phaedria to Dorio). The answer to Elmer's proposed question would be 'No,' but I agree with him that the speaker's attitude would justify the more emotional form, if we regard the perfect as such); 742, *ne me istoc posthac nomine appellassis* (Chremes to Sophrona). This is in accord with Elmer's theory).

#### 'CAVE' WITH THE PERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE.

*Faxis cave*, *And.* 753 (Davus to Mysis); 760, *cave quoquam ex istoc excessis loco* (same persons); *H.T.* 187, *cave faxis* (Clitipho to Chremes, who wishes to invite Menedemus to breakfast); 826, *cave quicquam admiratus sis*, *Qua causa id fiat* (Syrus to Clitipho. Elmer classes this as a present); *Ad.* 458, *Geta. Si deseris tu, periiimus*. *Hegio. Cave dixeris*. Of the five instances, the first two are clearly in accord with Elmer's theory. The other three are almost on the border line, the speech of Clitipho being the weakest.



## 'NE' WITH THE PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE.

The following do not conform to Elmer's theory. In every case a failure to comply with the prohibition would result in a disaster of some sort to one's interests or feelings:

*And.* 291, (not given by Elmer), Quod per ego hanc te dextram oro et genium tuum, Per tuam fidem perque huius solitudinem Te obtestor, *ne* abs te hanc *segreges neu deseras* (The dying Chrysis to Pamphilus, urging him to save Glycerium from a life of shame. One cannot imagine a more emotional address); *H.T.* 292 (not in Elmer), Syre mi, obsecro, *ne* me in laetitiam frustra conicias; 939, (not in Elmer), Chremes, *Ne* quid *verere*, si minus (Menedemus about the dowry); 1028, (not given by Elmer), Obsecro, mi gnate, *ne* istuc in animum inducas tuum, Alienum esse te (Sostrata to Clitipho); 1049, (not in Elmer) Mi vir, te obsecro, *Ne* facias (Sostrata to Chremes' suggestion to Menedemus that he summon his daughter); *Eun.* 212, *Ne* istuc tam iniquo *patiari* animo (Phaedria to Parmeno); 388, Verum *ne* post *conferas* Culpam in me (Parmeno to Chaerea); 988, Ere, *ne* me *spectes*; me impulsore haec non facit (Parmeno to his master); *Ph.* 508, Heia, *ne* parum leno *sies* (Antipho to Dorio. Elmer regards this as dependent); 945, (not in Elmer), Obsecro, *Ne* facias (The frantic Chremes to Phormio, who threatens to tell Nausistrata of Chremes' Lemnian wife); *Hec.* 343, *Ne* mittas quidem visendi causa quemquam (Parmeno to Sostrata. I cannot understand why Elmer regards this as a prohibition and then classifies perfects with *ne*—quidem under his Subjunctive of Obligation or Propriety. This is one of the subtle distinctions in the theory which the average intellect fails to grasp); *Ad.* 942 (not in Elmer), *Ne* *gravere* (Aeschinus to Micio).

The following instances are in harmony with Elmer's view: *And.* 205, (not in Elmer), *ne* facias; 704, *ne* *erres* (possibly subordinate); 706, *ne* *credas*; 980, *ne expectetis*; *H. T.* 745, *ne* *quaeras*; *Eun.* 76,

*ne* *adflies*; 273, *ne* *sis*; 786, *ne* *metuas*; *Ph.* 419, *ne* *agas*; *Ad.* 22, *ne* *expectetis*.

## 'CAVE' WITH THE PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE.

The following examples are not in accord with Elmer's theory: *And.* 403, (not in Elmer), *Cave* te esse tristem *sentiat* (Davus to Pamphilus); *H. T.* 302 Perge, obsecro te, et *cave* *ne* falsam gratiam *studeas* inire (Clinia to Syrus); 1031, (not in Elmer), *Et cave* posthac, si me amas, umquam istuc verbum ex te *audiam* (Sostrata to Clitipho); 1032, (not in Elmer), At ego, si me metuis, mores *cave* in te istos *sentiam* (Chremes to Clitipho); *Ph.* 764, (not in Elmer), Sed per deos atque homines meam esse hanc *cave resciscat* quisquam (Chremes to Sophrona); 993, *Cave* isti quicquam *creduas* (Chremes to Nausistrata, referring to Phormio); *Ad.* 170, *Cave* nunciam oculos a meis oculis quoquam *demoveas* tuos (Aeschinus to Parmeno).

The following is in harmony with the theory: *Eun.* 751, *Cave* *ne* *amittas*.

Elmer appears to have omitted, intentionally or otherwise, all instances of *cave* with the first or third person, although citing them in Plautus.

## 'VIDE' WITH THE PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE.

Of the seven instances of *vide* with the present, all but the first and fourth are against Elmer's theory; *H. T.* 212, Tu, ut tempus est diei, *vide* sis ne quo hinc *abeas* longius (Chremes to Clitipho); 352, Tu es iudex: ne quid *accusandus* sis *vide* (Clitipho to Syrus); 369, Sed heus tu, *vide* sis ne quid imprudens *ruas* (Syrus to Clitipho); *Eun.* 380, *Vide* *ne* nimium calidum hoc sit modo (Parmeno to Chaerea); *Ph.* 803, Au, obsecro, *vide* *ne* in cognatam *pecces* (Nausistrata to Demipho); *Hec.* 484, Verum *vide* *ne* impulsus ira prave *insistas* (Laches to Pamphilus); *Ad.* 550, Syre, Obsecro, *vide* *ne* ille huc prorsus se *inruat* (Clitipho speaks).

The results of the investigation will be seen from the following table:

	For Theory.	Against Theory.	Doubtful.
<i>Ne</i> with Perfect ... ..	2 (100 per cent.)	—	3 (60 per cent.)
<i>Cave</i> with Perfect ... ..	2 (40 per cent.)	—	—
<i>Ne</i> with Present ... ..	11 (48 per cent.)	12 (52 per cent.)	—
<i>Cave</i> with Present ... ..	1 (13 per cent.)	7 (87 per cent.)	—
<i>Vide</i> with Present ... ..	2 (29 per cent.)	5 (71 per cent.)	—

In view of such results and those already reached by Bennett in his examination of the Plautine instances, we must conclude

that in Early Latin, 'there is no discoverable difference of emotional force in prohibitions (understanding 'emotion' as



Elmer would have us), whether expressed by *ne* with the perfect subjunctive, by *cave* with the perfect subjunctive, *ne* with the present subjunctive' (Bennett), or *cave* or *vide* with the present subjunctive. I have shown elsewhere (*A. J. P.* xxi. 154-169) that Elmer's theory is untenable for Silver Latin. If untenable for these two periods, it is certainly untenable for all and should be withdrawn.

Four instances cited by Elmer as subjunctives of obligation or propriety should be added for the sake of completeness.

They are *And.* 392, *Nec minueris*; *H. T.* 976, *Nec pararis*; *Hec.* 79, *Nullus dixeris*; *And.* 787, *Non credas*. Two additional instances (*Eun.* 1080, *Neque metuas*; *And.* 640, *Nil promoveris*) I cannot find in Elmer's papers on the prohibitive or *Cornell Studies* vi. I regard all six as genuine prohibitions.

WILLARD K. CLEMENT.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY,  
EVANSTON, ILL.,  
Oct. 12, 1900.

### THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE WARS IN ARMENIA, A.D. 51-63.

To be of value, any account of the wars in Armenia under Claudius and Nero between A.D. 51-63 must necessarily furnish and be based upon precise details alike of chronology and of geography. Failing either, the course of events and the strategy of the combatants are vague and unintelligible, and the historical merit therefore of the account is exceedingly small.

But alike the chronology and the geography of the wars in Armenia have been matters of great controversy and widely different conclusions. Here it is my intention to confine myself to a consideration of the former, viz., the chronological difficulties involved, and to present certain conclusions. For a study of the whole chronological question *de novo* compels me to think that we cannot with satisfaction follow any one modern writer throughout, whether he be editor of Tacitus or professed historian.

Some of these modern writers are of no independent value in this connection whatever. Schiller for instance in his very long 'Geschichte des römischen Kaiserreiches unter der Regierung des Nero' (Berlin, 1872) as in his later *Gesch. der röm. Kaiserzeit*, adopts almost without discussion the chronological scheme furnished him by Emil Egli, and, if he is conscious on one solitary occasion of the possibility of another view, manages to misunderstand this before rejecting it. For our purpose of fresh inquiry, his *History of Nero* is a negligible quantity. Neither do Rawlinson or Merivale contribute anything of value to this subject. Those who have given independent consideration to the chronological problems of the Armenian wars seem to be two editors of Tacitus, Nipperdey

and Furneaux, and two others, Emil Egli and Mommsen. These, where failing to agree, resolve into at most three systems of chronology for the years A.D. 51-63, for Furneaux follows Nipperdey so closely as to be practically identical with him, save in one or two minor points. Egli in his 'Feldzüge in Armenien von 41-63' (ap. Büdinger: *Untersuchungen zur römischen Kaisergeschichte*, Band I, pp. 265-364. Leipzig. 1868) discusses the whole chronological problem at length, without however gaining the adhesion throughout of Mommsen, who in footnotes to the fifth volume of his *Roman history* (i.e. in English Translation *The Provinces*, Vol. II.) and elsewhere suggests an arrangement of his own for some of these years.

It is then because after a fresh investigation of the whole question I find myself compelled to reject now Egli, now Mommsen, now the Nipperdey-Furneaux combination, and at times all three, that I propose here to deal succinctly with the whole controversy in periods, bringing out clearly, so far as I may, the decisive points in the disputes, balancing difficulty and argument against argument and difficulty, and presenting finally that chronological arrangement for the years 51-63 which the balance of evidence seems to me to justify.

The subject may conveniently be divided into three periods, dealing with:—

- I. A.D. 51-54 = Tac. Ann. xii. 44-51. xiii. 5. 6.
- II. A.D. 54-60 = Tac. Ann. xiii. 7-9. 34-42. xiv. 23-26.
- III. A.D. 61-63 = Tac. Ann. xv. 1-17. 24-31.

Throughout in dealing with each it will be my method first (A) to give in order the successive events narrated by Tacitus: secondly (B) to explain and contrast the different chronological systems deduced from Tacitus: thirdly (C) to discuss the respective difficulties of each: and lastly (D) to present that scheme, whether my own or one already suggested, which seems to me on all the evidence the best. Merely negative conclusions are in this matter for me insufficient.

# I.—A.D. 51–54.

## A. Tacitus' Order of Events:—

- A. 'Eodem anno—[viz.: Ti. Claudio quintum Servio Cornelio Orfito consulibus: viz.: 51 A.D.] bellum inter Armenios Hiberosque exortum.' Pharasmanes of Iberia sends his son Radamistus to invade Armenia, then under rule of Pharasmanes' brother Mithradates. The war actually begins then in this year.—xii. 44.
- B. Mithradates besieged in Gorneae, where is a Roman garrison under Caelius Pollio, prefect, and Casperius, centurion.—xii. 45.
- C. Radamistus offers bribes to Pollio to betray Gorneae. Casperius protests and departs (i) to dissuade Pharasmanes from prosecuting the war, failing which (ii.) to inform Ummidius Quadratus, legate of Syria, of the state of Armenia.—*ib.*
- D. Casperius reaches Pharasmanes. Meanwhile Pollio has been urging Mithradates to surrender.—xii. 46.
- E. Message from Pharasmanes to Radamistus, warning him 'oppugnationem quoquo modo celerare.' The bribe offered Pollio is increased and the soldiers are incited to compel Mithradates to surrender.—*ib.*
- F. Meeting of Mithradates and Radamistus. Seizure and slaying of the former. Radamistus seizes the kingship of Armenia.—xii. 47.
- G. Quadratus hears of this († from Casperius) and calls a Council of War. This decides to do nothing save send envoys to Pharasmanes bidding him withdraw from Armenia and recall Radamistus.—xii. 48.
- H. Julius Paelignus, procurator of Cappadocia, collects provincial auxilia 'tamquam recipaturus Armeniam,' plunders his allies rather than the enemy, is deserted by his men, on 'a

barbarian incursion' flees to Radamistus, and, bribed by him, urges him to put on the royal insignia and is present, 'auctor et satelles,' at the coronation.—xii. 49.

- I. Quadratus hears of Paelignus' proceedings and despatches Helvidius Priscus, legate, with one legion from Syria, to mend matters.—*ib.*
- K. Priscus crosses Mount Taurus and has already restored order in a large measure when
- L. Quadratus sends and recalls him to Syria, 'ne initium belli adversus Parthos existeret,' he hearing of Vologeses' intentions and preparations to set Tiridates on the throne of Armenia.—*ib.* and 50.

[NOTE.—Mommson (E.T. II. p. 49) speaks of Q. recalling 'the legion put upon the march from Syria,' as though Priscus had never reached his destination whether this was Cappadocia, or, as Mommson suggests, Armenia. Tac. words certainly prove he *did* reach it and *had* spent some time there before recall].

- M. Vologeses, King of Parthia, invades Armenia to set his brother Tiridates on the throne.—xii. 50.
- N. Radamistus and the Iberians 'sine acie pulsi.' The Armenian cities Artaxata and Tigranocerta submit. First flight of Radamistus.—*ib.*
- O. 'Deinde atrox hiems' and insufficient supplies compel Vologeses to retreat from Armenia.—*ib.*
- P. 'Vacua Armenia,' [*i.e.* Tiridates has also withdrawn].—*ib.*
- Q. Radamistus returns again to Armenia, thus left without a ruler, and makes himself king for the second time.—*ib.*
- R. Harsh rule of Radamistus in Armenia.—*ib.*
- S. Rising of Armenians against Radamistus. Second flight of Radamistus with his wife Zenobia, whom, as unable to accompany him further, he stabs and casts into the river Araxes. She is found by shepherds and carried to Artaxata.—xii. 51
- T. Zenobia brought from Artaxata to Tiridates and treated kindly by him.—*ib.*

[Immediately following on this Tacitus opens the next chapter with the words 'Fausto Sulla Salvio Othone consulibus,' viz.:

the consuls of 52 A.D. (xii. 52, 1).

There is no mention of events in the East again till Book xiii. c. 5, in the year 54 A.D., viz:—

U. Armenian envoys appear at Rome and plead before Nero.—xiii. 5.

[Nero became Emperor on 13th Oct. A.D. 54].

V. 'Fine anni' (viz. A.D. 54) 'turbidis rumoribus prorupisse rursum Parthos et rapi Armeniam adlatum est, pulso Radamisto, qui saepe regni eius potitus, dein profugus, tum quoque bellum deseruerat. Igitur in urbe sermonum avida, quem ad modum princeps, vix septemdecim annos egressus, suscipere eam molem aut propulsare posset . . . anquirebant.'—xiii. 6.

[Nero was 17 years old on Dec. 16, A.D. 54].

W. Nero's provisions for war with Parthia. (See *Second Paper*).

In this narrative Tacitus marks clearly

(a) The beginning of the war in 51 A.D.—(A).

(b) The news of Radamistus' last expulsion reaches Rome by rumour in December 54 A.D.—(V).

(c) A winter intervening at some point.—(O).

Expressly he narrates nothing whatever in the years 52 and 53 A.D. of these events. Hence the difficulty arises: do all the events A–T belong to 51 A.D. or are they to be distributed over the years 51–54 A.D.? And to which year belongs the 'winter' of 'O'?

#### B. The Rival Schemes:—

There are two arrangements of the chronology of these events.

##### 1. Nipperdey–Furneaux:

The result of both editors' systems is the same, although there are slight differences in detail. Nipperdey (ad Ann. xii. 14) e.g. places the accession of Vologeses to the Parthian throne in the year 52–53, believing that the latest coins of his predecessor Vonones II. and the first of his own reign belong to the year from the autumn of 52 to that of 53. This necessarily causes him to place Vologeses' invasion of Armenia ('M') in 53 A.D.

Later numismatic research now makes it appear that the entire reign of Vonones II. was comprised in the Parthian months

NO. CXXXI. VOL. XV.

Panemus and Loius of the year 362 of the Seleucid Era, corresponding roughly to June and July A.D. 51. The accession of Vologeses then may be securely dated in August 51 A.D. (cf. P. Gardner, 'The Parthian Coinage'—*International Numismata Orientalia*, London 1877, pp. 22, 50, 51). Furneaux, however, accepting this, still follows Nipperdey in placing Vologeses' invasion in 53, save when he is inconsistent with himself. For it follows that the '*Atrox Hiems*' of 'O' is the winter of A.D. 53–54. This is Nipperdey's view and Furneaux adopts it in two places (ii. p. 106, n. 5; p. 278, col. 1). In one place (ii. p. 107, line 13) he calls it the winter of A.D. 52–53, which must be regarded as an oversight.

Then in A.D. 54 comes the final occupation of Armenia by the Parthians consequent on Radamistus' expulsion. This, as Furneaux well points out (ii. p. 106, n. 5), cannot have taken place before this year, as the news reaches Rome after the death of Claudius. And it follows essentially on this view that the break in the Tacitean narrative between xii. 51 and xiii. 5 does not involve any break in time i.e. that the expulsion of Radamistus in xiii. 5 is the second flight of xii. 51, and that the Tacitean narrative in xii. 44–51 covers the four years A.D. 51–54.

This then is the Nipperdey–Furneaux scheme, with which Mommsen (E.T. ii. p. 47) is in agreement:—

- |     |          |  |
|-----|----------|--|
|     | A.D. 51. | The peaceful intrigues of Radamistus preceding his first actual invasion of Armenia.   |
| A–L | 52.      | The first invasion of Radamistus and its results.  |
| M–N | 53.      | Invasion of Vologeses. First flight of Radamistus.   |
| O–P | 53–54.   | The <i>atrox hiems</i> . Withdrawal of Vologeses.  |
| Q–W | 54.      | Return of Radamistus and his second flight. Renewed occupation of Armenia by the Parthians, and Tiridates set on the throne. The news reaches Rome at the end of the year. |

There are three main objections to this view, to be presently considered after presenting the rival scheme.

##### 2. Egli:

This view follows more closely the apparent grouping of events by Tacitus. The actual invasion of Radamistus is placed

by Tacitus in 51 A.D. Vologeses coming to the throne (according to Egli in A.D. 50) seizes the earliest opportunity of invasion, viz., that same summer. The winter which compels his retreat is then that of 51-52 A.D. Tacitus then, before mentioning the consuls and other events of 52 A.D. into which year this winter conducts us, anticipates events, but only by a few months. The return and second flight of Radamistus will be in the spring or summer of 52 A.D., for the river Araxes into which Zenobia was cast was unfrozen and the flocks were evidently pasturing in the open ('S.'). Thus we reach the summer of 52 A.D., where the narrative breaks off in xii. 51.

The narrative is resumed late in 54 A.D. in xiii. 5. The break in the narrative thus implies a break in time, viz., from 52-54 A.D. Concerning the events of these years in Armenia, Tacitus is entirely silent, but we may suppose them filled with new quarrels between Tiridates and Radamistus, such as are indeed implied in Tacitus' words concerning the latter '*saepe regni eius potitus, dein profugus*' (V) whereas in his actual narrative he has mentioned only *two* occasions when Radamistus acquired and then again lost possession of the Armenian throne—(F and Q). To suppose that his second flight is his last flight (as does the first scheme) makes '*saepe*' mean 'on two occasions.' 'Das geht aber nicht an.'

Thus between the summer of 52 and 54 there must have occurred fresh quarrels between Radamistus and Tiridates, and more flights and more restorations of the former. But all this petty warfare was too unimportant for Tacitus' mention, and he resumes the narrative only when news of Radamistus' final expulsion reaches Rome and Nero thus, when Tiridates' possession of the throne is really a *fait accompli*, has to decide on a policy.

It follows then on this view that the break in the Tacitean narrative between xii. 51 and xiii. 5 implies a considerable break in time.

This then is the Egli scheme:—

- A-L A.D. 51. summer. — Iberian-Armenian war.  
 M, N „ „ late summer.—Vologeses' invasion. Radamistus' flight.  
 O, P „ 51-52. The '*atrox hiems*.' Withdrawal of Vologeses.  
 Q, R „ 52. spring.—Return of Radamistus.  
 S, T „ „ summer.—Second flight of Radamistus. Return of Tiridates.

- S, T „ 53, 54. Unrecorded warfare.  
 U „ 54. summer.—Armenian embassy to Rome.  
 V, W „ 54. winter.—Nero's measures.

#### C. Discussion of the Schemes:

To both these schemes certain difficulties are attached.

#### Difficulties in 1 (Nipperdey-Furneaux):

(a) The actual beginning of the Iberian-Armenian war is placed by Tacitus in 51 A.D. It seems impossible to take the words '*eodem anno bellum exortum*,' to apply merely to the preliminary treacherous plots of Radamistus, as does this scheme. Tacitus most certainly implies that actual hostilities began in 51 A.D., not in 52 A.D.

(b) Tacitus after narrating all the events A-T (xii. 44-51) proceeds at once to narrate the consuls and events of 52 A.D. This scheme makes A-T embrace the years 51-54 A.D., i.e., anticipate the events of xii. 52, viz. of 52 A.D. by three years. Tacitus betrays not the least consciousness of any such great anticipation of events on his part. That there is some slight anticipation is obvious from his mention of the winter in O, which may be taken as equivalent to a direct assertion on his part that in order to secure continuity of treatment he has anticipated the events of the following year. [Such a direct assertion e.g., we have in xiii. 9, 7: '*Quae in alios consules egressa coniunxi*']. But though we are justified in supposing such slight anticipation in xii. 44-51, it is extending the principle unduly to make these chapters cover so long a period without any statement by Tacitus to that effect.

(c) Radamistus '*saepe regni eius potitus*' (V.) But this scheme with its immediate chronological connection of T and U, treating the Tacitean narrative as complete, must make '*saepe*' actually come to mean 'on two occasions.' For Tacitus mentions only two occasions on which Radamistus seized the kingship (F and Q). Furneaux shows that he feels this an objection when he speaks of Radamistus 'keeping up some desultory warfare' between the date of his second flight and the end of

54 A.D. (Note to xiii. 6, 1.). Insisting on the word 'saepe' we must take Tacitus to imply warfare continuing which, however, he has not thought it worth while to record.

None of these difficulties are present in the second scheme. According to it the war does begin in 51 A.D. (a); the anticipation of events in the narrative reaches only to 52 A.D., viz., one year and not three (b); and it supposes more expulsions and restorations of Radamistus in the otherwise blank years 53 and 54, thus justifying the 'saepe' (c).

On the other hand the second scheme itself labours under a not inconsiderable disadvantage—apart from this supposition of two years' unrecorded warfare.

#### *Difficulties in 2 (Egli):*

This disadvantage is the very great compression of events in the year 51 A.D. The campaigning summer in Armenia is at most five months, from May to September, though we may allow one additional month for campaigning in Southern Armenia. The campaign opens with a siege in the extreme North, viz.: at Gorneae = Bash Garni, a few miles east of Erivan, and north of the Araxes, and the natural place for a garrison-outpost of Artaxata. Thus it can hardly begin before May. From thence onwards many events are recorded, all taking much time. These are (1) the blockade of Gorneae; (2) the negotiations with Pollio; (3) the journey of Casperius to Pharasmanes; (4) the message from Pharasmanes to Radamistus; (5) the surrender of Mithradates; (6) the time taken for the news of this to reach Quadratus and Paelignus; (7) Paelignus' preparations and expedition; (8) his flight to Radamistus; (9) the time taken for the news of this to reach Quadratus; (10) Quadratus' consequent measures; (11) Priscus' march over Taurus; (12) Priscus' stay and restoration of order (?) in Armenia; (13) the time taken for Quadratus' message of recall to reach Priscus; (14) Vologeses' invasion; (15) surrender of Artaxata; (16) surrender of Tigranocerta; (17) the winter.

Now on this scheme all these events are crowded into some five months. Surely the compression is too great. This impression is strengthened when the attention is directed chiefly to the later events here mentioned.

Egli supposes that Vologeses came to the throne of Parthia in 50 A.D., or at least early

enough in 51 to allow him to invade Armenia in the summer.

But it appears he came to the throne only in August 51 (cf. *supra*). He then after this has

- (i.) To plan the overthrow of Radamistus and make all his preparations for an invasion of Armenia, which preparations last long enough for Quadratus in Syria to hear of them and send to recall Priscus in consequence (L).
- (ii.) To invade Armenia and receive the submission of the two widely distant towns of Artaxata in the extreme north, and Tigranocerta in the extreme south, over 450 kilometers away as the crow flies, before winter compels his retreat. (N).

For all this, on this scheme, but a bare two to three months at most is available. Egli very justly assumes that Vologeses is eager to carry out his compact with his brother Tiridates and invade Armenia as soon as possible. Moreover, winter evidently surprised him before his work was done. Yet on the scheme, the time even so seems far too short, the more closely the difficulties of campaigning in Armenia are considered. The capture of Artaxata and Tigranocerta, as I hope to show later, took Corbulo one whole campaigning year, though the resistance offered him was of the slightest. Thus the general impression produced by this scheme is one of a well-nigh impossible crowding of events into the one year 51 A.D.

#### *D. Conclusion:—*

Of the difficulties urged against the first scheme, the first is certainly valid. An attempted answer to the third is, as it is presented in Nipperdey and repeated by Furneaux, partially misleading. Nipperdey quotes one other passage in Tacitus to prove use of 'saepe' meaning 'twice.' This passage, the reference to which is reinserted in Furneaux, does not prove his case.

In Ann. iii. 18, 2, Tacitus speaks of Tiberius as 'satis firmus, ut saepe memoravi, adversus pecuniam.' There are only two passages, declares Nipperdey, where Tacitus mentions this trait in Tiberius' character, viz. i. 75 and ii. 47. Hence here in iii. 18, 2 'saepe' is used loosely and rhetorically for 'twice.'



But this supposed parallel does not hold good. For in

- i. 75—Tacitus mentions two instances of Tiberius' generosity, viz. to Pius Aurelius and Propertius Celer: similarly in
- ii. 47—to twelve cities of Asia: and in
- ii. 48—comments on his 'private' as well as his 'public' generosity, viz. to Aemilius Lepidus and M. Servilius, adding the general statement 'neque hereditatem cuiusquam adiit nisi cum amicitia meruit.'

Tacitus then is more justified in stating that he had 'frequently' mentioned cases of Tiberius' firmness 'adversus pecuniam' than we are in saying he has mentioned it twice only.

Doubtless there are certain kindred loose usages of words—as of 'semper' in xv. 47, for 'on two occasions': of 'omnes' in i. 13, 3—applying really to 'three' only (not 'two,' as Nipperdey): of 'tot' in the 'tot per annos' in vi. 24 as really meaning 'three' years only (as Dio lviii. 3 shows). Tacitus does allow himself a certain loose rhetorical exaggeration, and this may possibly extend to 'saepe' in xiii. 6. And here it would be the easier to suppose this as, though Tacitus states the 'saepe regni potius, dein profugus' directly as his own remark, yet it may very well be but the repetition of the rumours then current in Rome, and popular talk is not apt to care for statistical accuracy.

We may on this point conclude that there is no absolute impossibility in supposing that Radamistus seized the kingship twice only, despite the 'saepe': i.e. that this word 'saepe' is no absolute bar to accepting a scheme which connects xii. 51 without any great interval of time with xiii. 5. But nothing is gained for this view of the case by adducing iii. 18, 2 as a confirmatory parallel.

As regards the second objection, that there must be some anticipation of events in Tacitus xii. 44–51 is certain. *Ceteris paribus*, the scheme which involves the least anticipation is preferable to its rivals.

The objection to the second scheme of over-crowding of events is so far valid that on this ground some other scheme involving their fairer distribution would be preferable. It must be admitted, however, that the fairer the distribution, the greater the anticipation of events is. No scheme, there-

fore, can be devised which is not liable to one or other objection. Inasmuch as the fact of some anticipation is admitted, perhaps it is better in the final choice rather to seek a distribution of events which shall be possible than to endeavour to avoid their anticipation.

Coming then to the final choice, it is important to insist on the following points of probability for guidance:—

- (1) The first invasion of Radamistus took place in 51 A.D.
- (2) The whole course of events which followed this necessarily implies the lapse of a considerable amount of time. Especially this is true of the expeditions of Paelignus and of Priscus, and of the stay of the latter in Armenia spent in the restoration of order.
- (3) Radamistus therefore probably remained for some time in possession of the throne of Armenia before his expulsion by Vologeses.
- (4) Vologeses did not ascend the Parthian throne until August 51 A.D.
- (5) The whole course of events which followed this necessarily implies, in view of the geography and climate of Armenia, the lapse of more time than is remaining available in that year: viz. his preparations for the invasion of Armenia, which are long enough for Quadratus to hear of them and send to recall Priscus: his actual invasion, and the submission to him of the widely separated towns of Artaxata and Tigranocerta.
- (6) Radamistus probably remained some time in possession of the throne of Armenia after his return, because his harsh rule compels the 'patient' Armenians to rise against him, and for this 'patientia' to be overcome by his severity requires some considerable duration of rule.
- (7) News of his final expulsion by Tiridates reaches Rome by Dec. A.D. 54 and possibly a month or two earlier.

The scheme which satisfies these points I construct as follows.

A–K A.D. 51. Invasion of Radamistus. Surrender and death of Mithradates. Expeditions of Paelignus and Priscus. Radamistus on the throne.

- L-N „ 52. Invasion of Vologeses. Flight of Radamistus.  
 O-P „ 52-53. The *atrox hiems*. Withdrawal of Vologeses.  
 Q-R „ 53. Return and harsh rule of Radamistus.  
 S-W „ 54. Expulsion of Radamistus. Return of Tiridates. News of this reaches Rome.

Compared with the two schemes hitherto suggested, this third one presents certain advantages.

It is entirely devoid of the objection of over-crowding of events, which goes far to invalidate the second scheme.

Of the three objections to the first scheme, it gets rid entirely of the first. It does imply an anticipation of events by Tacitus which is more considerable than that implied by the second scheme. But that is, as I have suggested, probably a lesser evil than that of over-crowding, with a consequent blank record for at least two years. That Tacitus seems entirely unconscious of any such blank years is to be taken into consideration. In this third scheme 'saepe'

must be taken as rhetorically used of but a double acquisition of the kingdom. And xiii. 5 is taken to follow chronologically closely on xii. 51—allowing that Tiridates' return took place in the interim—itself doubtless a matter of some time. It seems also to have been in these years A.D. 53-54 that Vologeses was kept busy in Parthia by his preparations for attacking Izates, the feudatory king of Adiabene, and by an invasion of Parthia by the Dahae (Josephus *Ant. Jud.* xx. 4. Rawlinson, 'Parthia' c. 16). This would fit in well with the third scheme, which allows Radamistus to rule undisturbed in 53-54 A.D., until he is expelled, not by the Parthians, but by his own subjects, whose patience at last gives way.

On the whole it seems to me that if we had to choose between the first and second schemes, that of Egli is preferable. But a third scheme may be devised of greater probability and fewer difficulties than either. And this third scheme I have here suggested.

BERNARD W. HENDERSON.

Merton College, Oxford.

(To be continued.)

#### THE DISCOVERIES OF POGGIO.—A CORRECTION.

I HAVE in two previous articles published in this *Review* (July 1896 and March 1899), discussed some questions concerning two Madrid MSS. which contain certain works discovered by Poggio in 1416-1418. The general conclusion to which I came was that, while the first of these (X 81), containing Asconius and Valerius Flaccus, was in all probability written by Poggio himself, the second (M 31), containing Manilius and the *Silvae* of Statius, was written for him by a Swiss or German scribe. I also ventured to make some suggestions concerning the MSS. of Silius Italicus, an author discovered shortly afterwards by Poggio, or by his colleague in the work of discovery, Bartolomeo de Montepoliciano. The only one of these authors concerning whom I was in a position to speak with any degree of authority was Asconius, since, although I have examined or collated the principal MSS. of Valerius Flaccus, I have not been able to make any minute study of him. With regard to the *Silvae* of Statius and

Silius Italicus I merely threw out suggestions for students of these authors to consider.

The main point in favour of which I argued in my second article has not been controverted, viz. that M 31 is the copy of Manilius and the *Silvae* made for Poggio by a local scribe of whom he speaks in a letter to F. Barbaro which I found in a Bodleian MS. (Canonici. Misc. 484). Klotz in his recent edition (Teubner, 1900), after quoting from the letter in question states without further argument the conclusion to which it points. To what extent his conviction is based upon my article or independently arrived at by himself or Dr. Krohn is a point upon which he is silent.

A suggestion which I made with regard to Silius Italicus was advanced in view of the statement made by Blass that all existing MSS. are derived from one copy brought to Italy by Bartolomeo de Montepoliciano. This appeared to me unlikely in itself and to be disproved by Poggio's letter to F.

Barbaro, in which he speaks of the copy made for him by his ignorant scribe. The phenomena in the case of Silius are the same as in that of Valerius Flaccus and of Asconius, and can only be explained by the existence of at least two transcripts of the original MS. The suggestion, therefore, which I made, viz. that FL represent the transcript of Poggio, and OV that of Montepoliciano appears to me very plausible.

My object in writing now is to retract a conjecture which I then made, to which objection has been rightly taken by Klotz in his edition of the *Silvae* (p. lxxx), and by Mr. Summers in the March number of this *Review*, viz. that F might possibly be the copy of Poggio written for him by his local scribe. If this were so, it would of course have to be in the same hand as M 31, and the description given of it by Blass made me hope that this would prove to be the case. I had written to Florence for photographs, intending to excise this portion of my article in case that I was disappointed. Unfortunately my letter remained unanswered, and the article appeared entire. It was not till some months afterwards that by the kindness of a friend I obtained photographs, and saw at once that F is in a totally different hand, and that the description given by Blass is most misleading. The hand employed in F is Italian of an ordinary type, and I see no trace of 'Gothic' influence about it. It is not, therefore, necessary for me to examine this MS. with what Mr. Summers so kindly terms my 'experienced eyes.' It will of course be understood that, although I withdraw the proposed identification of F, I do not withdraw the suggestion which I made that F and L in some way or other represent the transcript of Poggio as opposed to that of Montepoliciano. What this way is can only be determined by students of Silius, such as Mr. Summers. I have myself neither time

for the inquiry, nor requisite knowledge of the author.

I take this opportunity of referring to the view of Klotz concerning the *vetustissimus liber Poggii* containing the *Silvae*, which was used by Politian, and which, according to him, was written *Gallica manu*. Klotz considers that this was not M 31, as I had supposed, but a copy of it, i.e., that Politian made a mistake. This view explains the omission from Politian's copy of the mysterious line 1, 4, 86 a which is found in M 31, and appears to me quite convincing. Klotz, therefore, sets aside the readings recorded by Politian in the 'Corsinianum exemplar', as of no importance now that M 31 has been collated. While I agree with Klotz upon the main point, I do not think that he is right in his explanation of the phrase *Gallica manu* used by Politian. He says that *manu Gallica* = *littera antiqua*, and, as it is well known that Poggio himself wrote *littera antiqua* and had an amanuensis whom he trained to write in this style, Politian would naturally speak of a MS. written by Poggio or by his amanuensis as written *manu Gallica*. I cannot agree with this identification. I take *littera antiqua* to signify the beautiful hand used in Italy in the twelfth century, as opposed to the cramped and inartistic script by which it was succeeded. Specimens of this are to be found in MSS. written by Poggio himself, such as Laur. xlviii. 22, L 31, lxvii. 15, Vat. 3245, or proceeding from his school, such as Vat. 1613, 1614. Such expressions as *manus Gallica* or *manus Germani librarii* when used by Renaissance scholars denote a rough and illiterate script such as that found in M 31. I prefer, therefore, to suppose that in the transcript which Politian erroneously took to be the *vetustissimus liber Poggii* traces of the *manus Gallica* or *Germana* in which M 31 is written still survived.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

#### THE FROG OF HORACE, SAT. 1, 3.<sup>1</sup>

Trebatius Testa was patronus of Ulubrae and in his absence in Gaul Cicero seems to have undertaken to act for him. Writing from the villa of M. Aemilius Philo in the *Pomptinus Ager* Cicero tells Testa that he can hear the frogs of Ulubrae, which he supposes have bestirred themselves to do

him honour, i.e. as their deputy patronus. The letter is dated 8 April (Fam. vii 18) This confirms Mr Shipley's date of 'February to April or so.' I have heard them in Switzerland as late as the end of June, but I am not naturalist enough to know whether they are the same as the Italian frogs.

E. S. SHUCKBURGH.

<sup>1</sup> See *Classical Review* xv. 2, p. 117.

## REVIEWS.

## WHITE'S TRANSLATION OF APPIAN.

*The Roman History of Appian of Alexandria*, translated from the Greek by HORACE WHITE, M.A., LL.D. With maps and illustrations, in two volumes. London: George Bell & Sons, and New York. 1899. (2 vols. i-lxviii, 1-413; 1-554). 12s.

APPIAN proposed to write the history of Rome from the earliest times to the establishment of the Empire after the battle of Actium, and on to his own time. He died about A.D. 160. Of the work completed in twenty-four books we have some considerable extracts of Books i-v., apparently Books vi-viii. complete, fragments of ix., and x-xii. complete, besides five books on the 'Civil Wars' ending with the death of Sextus Pompeius B.C. 35. The period of Roman history, however, which he covers cannot be stated by limits applying to the whole work because of the plan which he proposed to himself and carried out. This was to take the history in separate blocks, generally marked off by the several nations with whom the Romans were from time to time engaged, and whom they eventually absorbed in the Empire. Thus, after devoting one book to the kingly period, and a second to the wars with various Italic peoples, a third to those with the Samnites, a fourth to the Gauls, and a fifth to Sicily and other islands—of which book we have only fragments—we have a long book (the sixth) devoted to the wars in Spain down to the pro-praetorship of Julius Caesar (B.C. 61), while in the seventh and eighth books we have the history of the Punic wars from the beginning to the destruction of Carthage in B.C. 146, though the earlier of the two books is devoted exclusively to the Hannibalian War. Book ix. contained the history of the Macedonian wars to the fall of Perseus; Book x. the Illyrian wars; Book xi. the Syrian wars to the battle of Magnesia (B.C. 190) followed by a sketch of the earlier and later history to the fall of the Seleucidae (B.C. 63). The twelfth book is devoted to the Mithradatic wars down to the death of Mithradates in B.C. 63, with a sketch of the subsequent fortunes of his dominions. It is evident that these periods must overlap each other, and the result is that a reader, whose object is to follow the general stream of Roman history, is constantly thrown back

and perhaps loses the thread that unites these episodes. Yet the arrangement has certain advantages, and in a way foreshadows the modern fashion of specialisation, in accordance with which historians are apt to appropriate a 'period' as peculiarly their own, and to be content with a very slight knowledge of others. The intrinsic value of a history written so long after most of the events narrated must depend upon the sources used and the accuracy with which they are employed; the chief accidental importance to us depends on the periods covered by the writer for which we have no earlier or better authority surviving. From this latter point of view the most valuable portions of the history of Appian are the later parts of the wars in Spain, especially the Lusitanian war, the war of Viriathus and Siege of Numantia, the later Illyrian wars, the affairs of Syria after the battle of Magnesia, and above all the Mithradatic wars, for which we have no authorities earlier than Appian except Plutarch's lives of Sulla, Lucullus and Pompey. Of the five books on the Civil Wars, the first covers a period down to the war of Spartacus for which the only earlier authority extant is Plutarch and in part Velleius Paterculus, while for the period from B.C. 63 to B.C. 35, though for part of it we have first-rate materials for history in the letters and speeches of Cicero, the Civil War of Caesar and the two other books printed among his works, besides a considerable fragment by Nicolas of Damascus, we have no continuous narrative earlier than Appian. From this point of view, then, Appian's work is of considerable importance to our knowledge of Roman History, and readers of Mommsen will have observed how frequently he depends for facts (and not seldom for deductions) on the authority of this writer.

The second point, as to sources used by Appian and the manner in which he has used them, is fairly discussed in Dr. White's introduction. The general conclusion—though it is by no means firmly established—is that with the exception of Livy and Sallust he relied mainly on Greek rather than on Latin writers, such as Diodorus, Dionysius, and Polybius. It will perhaps be best to take the case of one particular book, as a sample. In the first book of the



Mithradatic wars the points of agreement between Appian and Eutropius or Orosius (both of whom followed Livy closely) show that Livy was his principal guide, without correcting himself as he might have done by the writings of Posidonius or the memoirs of Sulla. In the second war ('War of Murena') he perhaps followed Nicolas of Damascus rather than Livy, for the tone of his narrative is anti-Roman, or at any rate impartial. In the third the discrepancies between him and Eutropius or Orosius—especially in proper names, but also in facts, such as the omission of the battle of Arsanias and the taking of Nisibis, and making the battle of Nicopolis to be fought by Pompey in the day instead of the night,—tend again to show that he did not use, or at any rate use exclusively or even generally, the work of Livy, as both Plutarch and Strabo did. We are almost forced to suppose that Nicolas was again his source:—that is, he prefers an inferior Greek to a better Latin authority.

As for the accuracy of his narrative, he makes the usual blunders in geography, for instance, Saguntum is placed north of the Ebro, and at another time confounded with New Carthage, Britain is only a half-day's sail from Spain and Panticapaeum (*Kertch*) is placed on the Bosphorus. Scipio Africanus the younger is called *son* of the elder Africanus, and is made to take part in the campaign against Antiochus, five years before he was born. In spite of these and similar blunders, however, the value of Appian's work is very considerable. There are passages in the Punic wars—for instance, the account of the final campaign of Scipio and Hannibal in Africa—in which he had some authority better than Livy; and in the 'Civil Wars' we probably have much drawn from the lost memoirs of Augustus and the history of Asinius Pollio: and the funeral oration of Antony, as well as the edict of the Triumvirs for the proscriptions, may well be translations of original documents. In view therefore of the great loss of historical literature in the Augustan period, Appian's work is of first-rate importance to students; and Dr. White has done a great service in presenting it in such clear and readable form for English-speaking students. The volumes are rendered more attractive by useful maps and some fairly good portraits of the principal Roman statesmen and generals. The translation itself is straightforward and clear. Some-

times one is tempted to wish for a little more brightness of style; and though in general very accurate, there are places in which there seems a doubt as to whether the translator has not expanded the Greek in a way to mislead. For instance, in iii. 9, (Vol. i. p. 28) Δέκιος δὲ φηλασόμενος ἐπιμελῶς οἷα πηρὸς ἑαυτὸν διεχρήσατο 'Decius being placed under strict guard, in the discouragement of a blind man, committed suicide.' I believe ἐπιμελῶς to be a mistake for ἀμελῶς and the sentence to mean that Decius was carelessly guarded as being already disabled. At any rate the οἷα πηρὸς can hardly refer to the motive of the suicide. 'Thus had Pyrrhus come to grief' (ἐπεπράχει κακῶς) may be said in modern parlance to 'lack distinction' as a translation, and there are a few other phrases of the same sort that might be better away, such as 'knowing to the crime,' 'appointed of Octavius,' 'she fixed him up as a charcoal dealer.' In Bell. Civ. i. 4, αἰτιώμενος 'alleging as a reason' is hardly well represented by 'He charged that it was not the wish of the Senate,' etc. In the account of the ceremonies of Octavian's adoption (Bell. Civ. iii. 334) it is rather misleading to translate ἐν τῶν ἀπατόρων 'in the case of orphans,' though it is true that Appian himself has a very imperfect understanding of the nature of a *lex curiata* in an adoption. In his note to Bell. Civ. iii. 45 (vol. ii. p. 246) Dr. White seems to confuse Alba Fucensis, where the Martian and Fourth Legions stopped and repelled Antony's overtures, with Alba Longa. Notwithstanding these and similar minor blemishes, the translation is accurate and clear and the notes useful. As no English translation existed of the entire works of Appian later than 1679 (preceded by one in 1578), and as both these are unsatisfactory and not easy to obtain, Dr. White has done good service to students of Roman History by his two handy and well-printed volumes, with their excellent index. He could not have better employed the intervals of leisure during the five years which he tells us he has devoted to this work. The first volume, besides the translator's preface, contains a translation of Mendelssohn's preface on the MSS. of Appian in the Teubner edition of 1879. It is not quite clear for whom this is intended. Scholars would use the original, while the 'general reader' will not care for an elaborate discussion of MSS. authorities.

E. S. SHUCKBURN.



## MEISTERHANS' GRAMMAR OF ATTIC INSCRIPTIONS.

*Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften*, von K. MEISTERHANS, dritte vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage, besorgt von Eduard Schwyzer. Berlin, 1900. 9M.

To Greek students acquainted with the vicissitudes which classical texts have undergone at the hands of copiers and theorists during Graeco-Roman and Byzantine times, and desiring to gain an insight into the true state of the language as generally received in ancient Greece, no book could be more acceptable than a good grammar and a lexicon of the language as portrayed in the ancient inscriptions. It was a happy thought of Meisterhans' then, when fifteen years ago (1885) he made the first attempt at classifying the material of the *C.I.A.* and issuing the results in the form of a short grammar. The favourable reception accorded to that pamphlet stimulated its author, and so three years afterwards he issued a more systematic and greatly enlarged volume of 237 pp. That second edition then soon found its way into all classical libraries and has ever since become a household book among Greek scholars. Meanwhile the inscriptional material having greatly increased and at the same time grammar having been reconstructed on more critical and sounder principles, it was only natural that Meisterhans' book should require a fresh revision and overhauling. Unfortunately the author himself has not lived to prepare and issue the required new edition, and the task devolved upon Ed. Schwyzer, favourably known—under the name of Schweizer—as the author of a valuable *Grammatik der Pergamentinschriften* (Berlin, 1896). We learn from the present editor's preface that, in addition to the 'extensive collectanea' left by the lamented author, he has perused once more the entire *C.I.A.* and excerpted the inscriptional material published since the appearance of the second edition in 1888; he further states that he has laid under contribution all recent literature on the subject, though among the list of authorities added to Meisterhans', we miss a number of important publications, e.g. W. Larfeld's *Griech. Epigraphik*, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, *Classical Review*, Th. Eckinger's *Orthographie lateinischer Wörter in Griech. Inschriften*, Ch. Michel's *Recueil d'Inscriptions Grecques*, and others. Our own *Historical Greek*

*Grammar* (1897) might also have been profitably consulted; however, as no English authorities are quoted, the omission may be attributed to the editor's unfamiliarity with the English language.

In its present or third edition the book, though preserving the same plan and arrangement, and even the old print and paper, appears in a form considerably improved and enlarged, since it covers 288 pp. as against 237 pp. of the second edition. The alterations and additions not being specially indicated, readers of the present edition cannot trace a given statement to its proper authority.

Critics may differ in their opinion as to whether a grammar of the Greek inscriptions should be founded upon the principles of comparative philology, or whether such a book should be 'a mere collection of the material,' (as Brugmann rather severely calls Meisterhans' work), systematically arranged in the form of a convenient grammar. For my part, I believe that the purpose of every class of students would be better served if we had a book of the latter class: a comprehensive grammar presenting the vast material in a handy and practical form, avoiding all speculation and provided with complete indices. Unfortunately this wish has still to be satisfied, seeing that even in this new edition Meisterhans still remains a mere 'survey' of the vast material. For beginning with the seventh century B.C., it traverses the bulk of the *C.I.A.*, then follows the spread of the Greek language in its Atticized form, both at home and abroad, through post-classical antiquity down to late Byzantine times (fifth century). Now it stands to reason that a short grammar covering such an immense period and area, cannot possibly give complete satisfaction. In the present case, moreover, students will miss the *μέτρος* of proportion and uniformity, inasmuch as the various periods of the inscriptions and the various parts of the grammar are disproportionately considered. Thus, once included in the plan, the period of Graeco-Roman inscriptions and papyri should have been more fully considered. On the other hand, when Phonetics alone covers no less than 100 pp., one would expect that Accidence would claim more than 77 pp., Etymology more than 4 pp., and Syntax more than 64 pp., now allotted to these parts respectively. I am also bound

to add that the two indices are far from being complete, so that students seeking information on particular points or periods of the language are likely to meet with disappointment. Thus, to pass over many single instances (e.g. 'Ατ(τ)υκός on p. 26, γεωργός 46, Καμυρής Καμερής 54), all the words discussed in pp. 34 and 49, words so interesting for their spelling, are missing in the index.

Another feature of the work which critical and accurate scholarship cannot but deprecate, is the practice adopted by the author and still followed by the present editor of changing or 'normalizing' the spelling of the inscriptions, and thus mislead or leave in doubt the reader as to the actual orthography of the original records. This principle appears to me unwarrantable, seeing that students may like to consult the book from various points of view. To be sure a grammar of the inscriptions ought to represent exactly and faithfully the actual vocabulary and spelling of the inscriptions themselves and not that of our normalized MSS. Moreover, the orthography current through the best or classical period of the language deserves full consideration and recognition both on account of its own merits and because it reflects the phonetic system and speech of the time. It is true that Meisterhans often preserves the spelling of the stones, especially in post-classical inscriptions, but this inconsistency only increases the evil of confusion, particularly when we read on the same page or even in the same paragraph or note such instances as (p. 242, Note 1904) *ἔως ἂν πραχθῇ* and *ἔως ἂν ἐξέλθῃ*, where the stone in both cases exhibits -θ*ει*; so too on p. 195 (Note 1594): *ὁθεν ἂν ἦ* beside *οὗ ἂν εἰ* for the [εἰ] and εἰ of the inscriptions, the latter of which, by the way, dates not from the year 320, but from 298-7 B.C.

Another point about which I have often felt misgivings is the frequent case where a definite statement is made in the text or body of the book, which statement is based upon a conjectural reading. Thus the assertions that 'στρατεύειν and διαλέγειν can stand for στρατεύεσθαι and διαλέγεσθαι (p. 192), and that 'ὅς can serve as an indirect interrogative pronoun' (p. 240), are supported by no better evidence than the following conjectures: [ἀνειπεῖν Διονυσίων ... τῷ] ἀγωνί ὡν ἔνεκα αὐτὸν ὁ δῆμος ἐστεφάνωσεν; στρατ[εύειν]; διαλέγοντ[ος αὐτοῦ] περὶ τῆς ἐνοια[ς]. διαλ[έγειν] μέλ[λη]. Again, for the statement (p. 241) that 'the

independent future appears in oaths and conventions' we are merely referred to a number of inscriptions in the *C.I.A.*

From these general remarks which may be profitably considered in a further fresh edition of the book or in a new work of the kind—for which there is much room—I pass over to the discussion of some details. To begin with p. 2 f. (§ 2), which deals with the old Attic alphabet, the prominence given to the symbol *Ϝ* among the 23 (rather 20) letters is hardly warrantable, and still less justifiable on p. 88 where it again occupies a special and prominent section. As a matter of fact, *Ϝ* could claim no more than passing mention in a note, since the three instances adduced, viz. *ναῦπηγός* (read -*πεγός*) *ἀφνάρ* and *ἀφντο* are demonstrably and admittedly cases of foreign importation into Attica.

On the same page (3) 'spurious' *ει* and *ου* are treated as if they were already familiar to the reader, whereas the distinction between spurious and genuine—better hysterogeneous and original—*ει* and *ου* is discussed long after, namely on pp. 20 and 26 respectively. In both places we are further told (Note 104 and 134) that the credit of having recognised and established a genuine *ει* and *ου* and a spurious *ει* and *ου* belongs to Dietrich (*K.Z.* xiv. [1865], pp. 65-70), who was followed by Brugmann, Cauer, G. Meyer, and Blass. As a matter of fact, the priority of that discrimination goes back to E. A. Sophocles or, to call him by his real name, Εὐαγγελινός 'Αποστολίδης, late Greek Professor in Harvard University, and author of the well-known Byzantine Lexicon. It was this shrewd scholar who in the second edition (I do not possess the first) of his *History of the Greek Alphabet and Pronunciation* (Cambridge, Mass., 1854) pp. 16-18, formulated very clearly and concisely what 14 years afterwards Dietrich succeeded only in vaguely indicating.

Pp. 14-74. Here Greek 'Vokalismus' is discussed at great length, a chapter which required thorough revision or rather recast, in order to separate the phenomena of analogy and orthographic practice from the phenomena of phonetic change, both of which are now indiscriminately crowded together. Thus in the alternative forms of *Σαραπίων* and later *Σεραπίων* (p. 14), the latter is due to the influence of *τέσσερα* and *Σεραφείμ*; likewise *Σακόνδος* (15) for *Σεκ* was suggested by *σάκος*, *Σάκας*, *Σακάδας*; 'Αρραβαῖος, (ib.) for 'Αρριβ- by 'Αραβικός; the name of the Libyan 'King' *Μασαννάσης* (ib., also p. 99 where it is mis-spelt *Μασανάσας* for

Μασινισσᾶς) by ἀνάσσω; διανεκής (16) for διην- by διαρκής; Ὀφιλίων and Ὀφιλίμη (18) for Ὀφελ- by φίλος φιλεῖν φίλτρον (occurring as it does in incantations with καταδέω!); Ὀρχιεύς and Ὀρχομένος (22) for Ἐρχ- by ὄρχος or ὄρχατος; ὀβελός ὀβελίσκος etc. (22 f.) by βέλος; ὀβολός τριώβολον etc. (ib.) by βολή or βόλος; Πυναφίων (23) by ἔψω; Πυανοφίων (ib.) by ὄψον; πρότανις and προτανεία (24) by πρόεδρος and προεδρεία; Μεταγετονίων (69) by γείτων; ἀγρόπολις (75) by ἀγρός; ὀλιωρέω (75) by πολινωρέω; ὀλιαρχία (ib. Note 650) by πολιναρχία; Φιλιεύς (75) by φιάλη; Ἐξυπατιών (93) for Ξυπ- by ἐξ-υπο-; κατοῦχος (115) by πολιοῦχος; Ἀνθέστιος (117) from Antistes by ἑστία and ἐφέστιος (cp. Ἀνθεστηριών); so further: δεῦρε (146) by ἄγε; ἀπορούμαι (192) by φοβούμαι, etc. Again, the aspiration in ἀκούσιος (86) is due simply to ἐκούσιος; ἔχω (87) to ἔξω (καθέξω-καθέχω); καθ' ἰδίαν (ib., common) to καθ' ἑαυτόν; ἀριθμός (103) to ἀρμός ἀρμόττω; εἰληφα (ib.) to εἰρηκα (ἤρηκα); ψηφισμένος (ib. and 194) to ἔψω; ἀφίσταλκα (169, Note 1415) to ἀφίσταττα; so too in the New Testament οὐχ εἶδον is due to οὐχ ὄρῳ; ἐφίδεν to ἐφορᾷ, etc. (Jannaris § 113). Conversely κατιστάσιν (85, Note 725) is due to κατέστησαν; κατ' ἡμέραν to κατ' ἔτος or κατ' ἑνιαυτόν; and so on.

On the other hand, the case of Θεαγένης (117) and Θεογένης is different; here Θεαγένης is conceived as the son of a θεά, whereas Θεογένης is the son of a θεός, just as Μοιραγένης, Τιμα-γένης, Ἡρα-κλῆς are associated with μοῖρα, τιμά, Ἥρα; just as ἱερωσύνη comes from ἱερός, whereas ἱερε(ι)ωσύνη comes from (τὸν) ἱερέα or (ῆ)ἱερεία. As to the alternative forms Ἀθηναία-νάα, αἰεῖ-αἰ, αἰετός-αἰετός (p. 31-33), if not due to epic influence, they are inseparably connected with the widespread orthographic phenomenon of dropping any intervocalic postpositive<sup>1</sup> iota, a case very common in the stem and almost regular in the terminations -αιος, -ειος, -οιος, -ηιος, -ωιος, -αῖκος, -αῖνος, etc. It is this phenomenon, then—rather orthographic than phonetic—that accounts for the apparent reduction of αἰ αἰ οἰ υἱ to α ε ο υ, in forms like ἐλά(ι)α, Ἀνακα(ι)εύς, Ἑστια(ι)εύς, Κρητα(ι)εύς, Πειρα(ι)εύς, Ἀθηνα(ι)ίς, Ἀχα(ι)ικός, Πειρα(ι)ικός, Προλεμα(ι)ίς, ἐλά(ι)ινος, δωρε(ι)ά, ἐπιμέλε(ι)α, ἱερε(ι)α, πολιτε(ι)α, χρε(ι)α, Αἰνέ(ι)ας, Αἰνε(ι)-αται, Ἀκαδήμ(ι)α, εὐγένε(ι)α, Ὑγίε(ι)α, ἀνδρέ(ι)ος, γραμματέ(ι)ον, κουρέ(ι)ον, (not κούρ- p. 43), πλέ(ι)ον, τέλε(ι)ος, Ἀρε(ι)ος, θε(ι)ός, Μεσόγε(ι)ος, Κλε(ι)ώ, στελε(ι)όν, πελε(ι)ίνος,

στο(ι)ά, πο(ι)εῖν, τριηροπο(ι)ικός, καταγαῦ(ι)α, παρεληφῶ(ι)α, ὀργυ(ι)ά, ἰ(ι)ός, Ἰλαῖν(ι)α, etc., etc. So further the cases of crasis (p. 71 f.) in the *scriptio continua*: (κα(ι)εγω) κάγω, (κα(ι)εμοι) κάμοι, (κα(ι)εῖτα) κᾶτα, (καίεαν) κᾶν, (μο(ι)εδόκει) μοῦδόκει, (σο(ι)εσσι) σοῦσσι, (δonna(ι)αν) δουνᾶν, etc. Whether this practice of freely dropping intervocalic ι was suggested by the similar practice of dropping ι subscript—then adscript—as: τῷ for τῷ = τῷ, ῆ for ῆι, ἐν τῷ (πρόνεωι), etc., or conversely, whether the insertion of intervocalic ι was suggested by the development of iota in the frequent case of hystero-geneous (spurious) diphthong εἰ (εἰς, εἰμί, πόλεις, φιλεῖν, εἶδε, τὸ εἶ), remains an open question. At any rate it is very striking that just as the ι adscript was often wrongly inserted, in the same way we frequently find a redundant ι inserted between two vowels, acting as it were like a mere divisor. Cp. ἐ<ι>άν (= εἰάν), ἐ<ι>αυτοῦ, τὸν βασιλέ<ι>α, ῥέ<ι>ω, δέ<ι>ηται, νε<ι>ός. Θε<ι>όκριτος, Θε<ι>οφάνης, γε<ι>ωργός, πρίσβε<ι>ων, βο<ι>θέιν, ὄγδο<ι>ος, χλό<ι>η, etc., etc. (pp. 45-47); cp. Jannaris § 20<sup>a</sup>. Whatever the origin of this orthographic phenomenon or fashion may have been, there is no doubt as to its nature and practice in the inscriptions, and had Meisterhans grasped the question and treated it synoptically under one heading, he would have spared himself the trouble of entering upon unnecessary speculations, repetitions, and inconsistencies, such as the statement (p. 57) that 'in the verb ποιεῖν the ἰῶτα can disappear everywhere before a succeeding e-sound (ε or η): ποιί, ποιῖσθαι, ποιήσω, etc., but not before a succeeding o-sound, hence: ἱεροποιοί, ποιῶ, ποιοῦσι, etc. For here the ἰῶτα is of necessity preserved for the obvious reason that its dropping would bring together two o's (ἱεροποιοῖ ποῶ = ΠΟΟ ποοοσι), a case manifestly inadmissible in Attic (hence even ὄγδο<ι>ος, besides ὄγδους (cp. Meyser Gramm. Griech. Pap. p. 43)).

As a matter of course where the material is to such a large extent ill-assorted and misinterpreted, the fault lies with the premisses, that is, with the phonetic principles adopted as the basis of the whole system. Thus it cannot be conceded (p. 24, 17) that 'the vowel ω, because it proceeds partly from α (τιμάμεν-τιμῶμεν), therefore must have been an open sound, differing from ο alike in quality and in quantity.' For, apart from the confusion here of 'grammatical' with 'phonetic' contraction, ω also proceeds partially from η: ση and ηο (ἀργῶ-ἀρωγή, μισθῶτον-μισθῶτον, νη-οδός-νωδός). Are we

<sup>1</sup> I.e. one which appears as the second element of a diphthong.

then to argue on the same principle that *a*, because it comes partially from *ε* (τιμάτε-τιμάτε, δέκων-άκων, φανός, ἄδω, ὄστᾱ, ἡμάς), therefore must have sounded not like *a* but something like German *ä*? Or are we to assume a variety of sounds for each vowel, corresponding to its grammatical or etymological genesis? (Cp. σαφῆ, ἦρος, βασιλῆς, then λόγων with Doric λόγω, πρῶτος with πρᾶτος, etc.)

Not more felicitous is the statement that the ancient Athenians sounded every *αι* as *αι̃*, despite the frequent occurrence in their inscriptions of such endings as -*αι̃ος*, -*αι̃νος*, -*αι̃της*, -*αι̃κός*, -*αι̃ς*, where the assumption of two consecutive iotas is quite inadmissible in Attic. Here *αι* must have been a single sound, something like a French *ai* or *é* (modern Greek *ai* or *e*), so that -*αι̃ος*, -*αι̃νος*, -*αι̃της* etc. sounded like -*aios*, -*ainos*, -*aitis* etc. On this particular point, as well as on the sound of *η* (p. 19), Meisterhans' speculations are singularly unhappy and even mischievous, inasmuch as they have already given rise to widespread confusion even among eminent scholars. On p. 19, he boldly states and on p. 34 again emphatically repeats, that '*η* and *αι* are confounded in the [Attic] inscriptions down to 150 A.D.' Now in support of this assertion the following evidence is adduced (p. 34): '*στήλης* (Dat. Plur.), *C.I.A.* iii. 7, 16 (117-138 n. Chr.); *Εὐκῆρος* 3, b, 16 (125-140 n. Chr.); '*Ἀνακηνός* 1569, 3 (nicht näher datierbar).' But to begin with '*Ἀνακηνός*', whether it stands for '*Ἀνακαινός*' or '*Ἀνακαεινός*' as it does in the next following inscription (1570), the word proves nothing, seeing that every unaccented *ε* (*ε* or *αι*: '*Ἀνακαεινός*') before a vowel can easily pass into *ι*: *η*, *ει*, etc. (Blass Pron. 35; Jannaris § 155). Then as regards *Εὐκῆρος*, Dittenberger himself, the editor of the inscription referred to, cautiously asks: '*Εὐκῆρος* i.e. *Εὐκ[αι]ρος*?' Here therefore we are not sure whether *Εὐκῆρος* stands for *Εὐκαιρος* or whether it contains the word *κῆρ* (cp. *Εὐτυχος*); at all events *Εὐκαίρος* is a mere guess. As to the third and last evidence, *στήλης*, if we open the volume of the *C.I.A.* referred to, we find that it occurs in a greatly mutilated inscription (iii. 7, 16 [not 15!]) in the following conjectural sentence: [*ἐπιμελείσθαι τῆς κατασκευῆς καὶ ἀναθέσεως τῆς στήλης*! How Meisterhans came to mistake this *τῆς στήλης* for a dative plural I am unable to guess; I only find that the blunder is repeated in all three editions of his book

and has this further strange interest, that it is appealed to by Blass (Pron. p. 66, Eng. ed.); that Meisterhans himself in his 2nd and 3rd editions (26 and 34) refers back to Blass, and that even Brugmann has fallen into the error (Gr. Gram. second edition p. 35, third edition 48) by appealing in his turn to both Meisterhans and Blass. To crown all, the present editor has not detected the blunder, and so he refers us to his own *Grammatik* (77 f.) and thence back again to Meisterhans.

However, in fairness to Meisterhans, I wish to point out that, considering their vast multitude, his references to the *C.I.A.* are generally accurate.

P. 82 f. deals with the alternative forms *μικρός* and *μικός*. The latter probably originated in the speech of little children and stammerers who cannot pronounce *ρ*. This very form with palatal *κ* (*μικός* or *μισός*) still survives in Crete in the sense of 'tiny.'

On pp. 258 f. which deal with the remarkable forms *οὐθεις-οὐθέν* and *μηθεις-μηθέν*, frequent in the inscriptions since 378 B.C., we are told: 'The feminine always preserves its form *οὐδεμία-μηδεμία*. For the explanation of this process see above § 40, 4.' On turning to the section referred to, we are merely told that here '*θ* appears for *δ* + *λ*.' For the explanation of this puzzling phenomenon I would suggest that the analogy of such common and fixed phrases as *καθ' ἑνα*, *καθ' ἑν*, *καθ' ἑνός*, *μεθ' ἑνα*, *μεθ' ἑν*, *μεθ' ἑνός*, *ἀνθ' ἑνός*, gave rise to *οὐθ' ἑνα*, *οὐθ' ἑν*, *μηθ' ἑνα*, *μηθ' ἑν*, and that from these familiar expressions common speech evolved a new nominative *οὐθεις-οὐθέν*, *μηθεις-μηθέν* (later on also *καθεις καθέν*). From this it follows that *οὐθεις-μηθεις*, *οὐθέν-μηθέν* can proceed neither from *οὐτε εἰς-μήτε εἰς*, *οὐτε ἑν-μήτε ἑν*, nor from *οὐδὲ εἰς-μηδὲ εἰς*, *οὐδὲ ἑν*, *μηδὲ ἑν*, and further that no feminine \**οὐθεμία-μηθεμία* could be evolved, seeing that there was no such set phrase as \**καθὰ μίαν*, \**μεθὰ μίαν* etc. to serve as a pattern.

There are numerous other points on which critical students will differ from the author and present editor. But as the space allotted to this review has already been exceeded, I finish by pointing out a number of misprints (not included in the *Zusätze* und *Berichtigungen*)—chiefly cases of misaccentuation—which I have noticed. Thus on p. 19 (note 96) we read *Μιλέσιος* (for *Μιλέσιος*); p. 36, 4 *κλησίον* (for *κλη*); 41 '*Ἀριστοδαμέ(ι)α* (twice), '*Ἀχλλέ(ι)α* (twice), *Μηδέ(ι)α* (twice); 42 *ὀμπρέ(ι)α*; *ιδ. κούρε(ι)ον*



(twice); 47 *θεράπη* (twice), *Λαδαμῆα*, *Ἄργηος* (twice); 50 *ἀγκυρεῖος*; 64 *ῥᾶδιος*, and *θηῆσκω*; 66 *τοῖ δῆμοι, τοῖ Διονύσοι* (for *τοῖ=τῶ*); 78 *Βένυστος* (sic for *Βένυστος*); 89 *Ἀσσεκλῆπιος*; 96 *Ἀτ(τ)ικος* (twice); 115 *καναύστρον* (twice) and *κανύστρον* (for *κάν-*); 119 *χαμεῖνα* (for *χά-*); 126 *τὸ καπηλεῖον*, *Ἀρίστανδρος* (for *τὸ καπ- τὸ Ἄρ-*); 129 *Μανίδι* (twice for *Μάν-*); 130 *Ἀπτεμ(ε)ῖν* (six times for *Ἀπτ-*); 131 (Note 1171) for 'Note 644' read '§ 27, 3'; 166 *παρελήφύα* (twice for *-φύα*); 192 *ἰδοῦ* (twice for *ἰδοῦ*, as on p. 203 twice); 203 *ἀγκύραι* (for *ἄγκ-*); 242 Note 1905 *περύσινος*

(for *-νός*). Most of these cases of mis-accentuation are repeated in the index.

In conclusion I feel bound to say that, inadequate and faulty though the book undoubtedly is, both in plan and detail, it still deserves grateful recognition; for it is, in its present edition especially, a very useful and I should say almost indispensable companion to all earnest students of the Greek language.

A. N. JANNARIS.

The University,  
St. Andrews, N.B.

# CORNELL STUDIES XI., XII.

*Cornell Studies in Classical Philology.* No. XI. Index in Xenophontis Memorabilia confecerunt CATHARINA MARIA GLOTH, MARIA FRANCISCA KELLOGG. Pp. 96.—No. XII. A Study of the Greek Paean. by ARTHUR FAIRBANKS, Ph.D. Pp. 166. Published for the University by the Macmillan Co.

The series of *Cornell Studies*, which now numbers twelve volumes, has scarcely maintained the standard set by its first member—Prof. Hale's well-known study of the *constructions*. But its volumes contain the results of much solid and useful work of the type which American scholars seem more ready to undertake than those of our own country. In the first of the volumes here to be reviewed two ladies provide us with an Index to the *Memorabilia* of Xenophon which (so far as we have tested it) seems to leave nothing to be desired on the score of accuracy or completeness within the limits fixed by the compilers. As to those limits the statement of the Preface '*Articulus merus et καὶ simplex omnia sunt*' is incomplete. Neither *οὐ* nor *δέ* is indexed when used alone. As *ἀλλὰ καὶ, εἰ γε* and the like are given separate articles, it seems a pity that *εἰ καὶ* and *ὥστερ καὶ* should not receive the like treatment. The number of a section in which a use recurs is repeated in the reference, so that we have such strange agglomerations as '8, 4, 4, 4, 4, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 6, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 9, 9, 9' (p. 76), which would surely look better in the shape '8, 4 (quater), 5 (septies), 6, 7 (sexies), 9 (ter),' especially as this method is adopted *e.g.* in the article *ῥ* (p. 40). We have no further criticism to make on the book as it stands,

but it seems to us doubtful whether it was worth while to compile an index of this kind to so small a portion of Xenophon's works. The fifth volume of the *Cornell Studies* was formed by van Cleef's Index to Antiphon, an excellent piece of lexicographical work, in which the context of each reference was given and the uses of each word analysed. A compilation of this kind, taking the *Memorabilia* as a specimen of Xenophon's work, might have been of much service to students of his diction. A merely verbal index—such as this practically is, save in the case of some particles—might be worth making for the whole of Xenophon, but is hardly so for so limited a portion of his text.

Dr. Fairbanks' *Study of the Greek Paean* lays more claim to originality, though the very full collection of *Schriftquellen* is what gives the book its principal importance. We miss but little in this list of 206 passages in which *παῖαν* and cognate words are used; Eustath. *ad. Il.* p. 1163, 55 (on the species of *ῥμνος*) and Bacchyl. xvii. 128 (an important passage, as will be seen later) should be added.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Fairbanks would have done better, moreover, to include the text of some passages to which reference is more than once made in the course of his essay—*e.g.* Plut. *de musica* cap. x. (of which only detached fragments appear amongst the *Quellen*) and Athen. 696 B. The former of these passages should also have been laid under contribution in making up the list of literary paeans extant or known from allusions (p. 101 ff.). The substance of the essay is arranged in seven chapters, whose

<sup>1</sup> Aesch. *Ag.* 145 is unaccountably misquoted *ἰλιον δ' ἐπανάκαλῳ Παῖαν*, *ἰλ.* Bacchyl. xvi. 8 (though the restoration is doubtful) should also be quoted.

object is to trace the origin and relationship of the various forms assumed by the paean in Greek literature and worship. A summary of the author's results is given in tabular form on p. 68, in which the various types of paean are arranged in divergent series. This leads to the singular result that the *παιανισμός* before and after battle stand at opposite ends of the scale. Dr. Fairbanks finds the root-meaning of the word to be a hymn of prayer in sickness or distress originally addressed to a divinity Paian (or Paieon), 'the Healer,' who was in course of time overshadowed by greater gods, usurpers of the healing function, such as Asklepios and above all Apollo. He can, however, scarcely be held to have achieved any conclusive proof that the god Paean is prior to the invocation *ὦ παῖάν*, nor does he add to the number of unsatisfactory guesses at the etymology of the word. It still seems to us the more probable view that the *παιανικὸν ἐπίρρημα*, whose ultimate derivation is irrecoverably lost, formed the starting point, and that the divinity (or epithet) was an abstraction. Dr. Fairbanks, when he leaves origins behind, discusses the various acts of religious worship in connection with which the word *παῖάν* is used with care and sound judgment; he seems to be but little interested in what to scholars in general must be the most attractive theme—the literary history of the paean. And yet his book surely fails to fulfil the promise of its title through this omission. We miss some fuller account of the relation between paean, dithyramb and hyporcheme, and of those early poet-musicians, such as Thaletas, Xenodamus and Xenocritus whose works the scholars of Alexandrian times found it so hard to pigeon-hole. It would have been interesting to show how the confusion of paean and dithyramb, to which we find an allusion in Plat. *Legg.* 700 D, led to the desperate makeshifts by which the Alexandrian editors of classical texts sought to

differentiate the classes. The doctrine that the *ἡρωικὴ ὑπόθεσις* distinguished the dithyramb—explicitly stated in Plut. *Mus.* 10—was clearly held, for instance, by the editor of Bacchylides, and thus we find the seventeenth poem—the ballad of Theseus and the Ring—classed amongst the *διθύραμβοι* (Serv. ad Virg. *Aen.* vi. 21), although it is a clear example of the paean, as is proved by the closing lines, in which the myth breaks into an invocation of Apollo in the words *ἦ θεοὶ δ' ἐγγύθεν νέοι παιάνιξαν ἑρατὰ ὀπί. Δάλιε, χόροισι Κηίων φρένα λανθεῖς ὀπαῖε κτλ.* Dr. Fairbanks, as was mentioned above, makes no allusion to this poem. More space might also have been given to the 'cretic' or 'paeonic' metre, which must surely have had an intimate connection with the religious paeans of Delphic worship; we would remind Dr. Fairbanks that the 'paeonic' lines quoted by Aristotle (*Rhet.* iii. 1409a 14) clearly belong to such ritual paeans. In return for a fuller treatment of the literary paean we would gladly sacrifice the appendix containing the paeans found in inscriptions, including those recently discovered at Delphi. By the last of these, which is addressed to Dionysus, Dr. Fairbanks might have been reminded (v. 1) that *Διθύραμβος* was lacking in his list (p. 8) of 'names of gods that are also names of songs.' The refrain *εὐοῖ δ' ὦ βάκχ' δ' ἦ παῖάν* more-over well illustrates the *κεπαννύντες παίωνας διθύραμβους* of Plato (*Legg.* 700 D, referred to above). Still, we must express our thanks to Dr. Fairbanks for the first commentary in English on the Delphic hymns.

We notice occasional misprints ('Eriphron' for 'Ariphron' p. 38 and 'Xenodamos' for 'Xenodamos' p. 47), and an awkwardly expressed statement on p. 7 which would imply that the famous sculptor of Mende was called, not Paionios, but either Paion or Paionaïos, it is not clear which.

H. STUART JONES.

#### DU PONTET'S TEXT OF CAESAR'S *GALLIC WAR*.

*C. Iulii Caesaris Commentariorum pars prior qua continentur Libri VII de Bello Gallico cum A. Hirti Supplemento.* Recensuit brevisque adnotatione critica instruxit RENATUS DU PONTET. Oxonii e Typographeo Clarendoniano. 1900. 2s. 6d.

MR. DU PONTET has the merit of knowing his own mind. He has been called a con-

servative; but it would be more accurate to describe him as a reactionary. In his brief, but pithy and interesting preface he refers to the long-standing controversy as to the comparative merits of the two families of Caesarian MSS. generally known as *α* and *β*. Nipperdey, whose authority remained for many years unchallenged, except by Heller, regarded *β* with contempt, though even he

was obliged to make use of  $\beta$  in many passages. But within the last fifteen years H. Walther, R. Richter, Meusel and Kübler have vindicated the claims of  $\beta$ . Mr. Du Pontet virtually sides with Nipperdey: 'libros conferentibus,' he says, 'praesertim quod ad verborum ordinem attinet, vel luce clarius patet familiam  $\alpha$  redolere anti-quitatem.'

Now all Caesarian scholars admit that it is impossible to construct a sound text without having recourse to both  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . In a considerable number of passages the MSS. of the former group are disfigured by lacunae: in a much larger number they contain manifest errors, which  $\beta$  enables us to correct. On the other hand,  $\beta$ , although it too contains numerous palpable errors, which are corrected by  $\alpha$ , is virtually free from lacunae. But, setting aside for the present certain disputed passages, in regard to which most modern editors have decided in favour of  $\beta$ , there are also a large number in which  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  exhibit different readings, each intrinsically unobjectionable, and in regard to which it appears extremely difficult, if not impossible, to arrive at a final decision. As Walther remarks (*De Caesaris codicibus interpolatis*, p. 2), 'nec mirum quod multis locis suae voluntati atque arbitrio inserviverunt editores.' It is true that, since the days of Nipperdey, criticism has made considerable progress, partly owing to the fact that the readings of  $\beta$  are better known to us than they were to him, and partly in consequence of the publication of Meusel's invaluable *Lexicon Caesarianum*. Fortunately, too, the great majority of the passages in which  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  differ are of such a kind that the various readings affect the sense very slightly or not at all. It is only from a linguistic and grammatical point of view that they are important. Thus again and again  $\alpha$  has *iis* and  $\beta$  *his*;  $\alpha$  *posset* and  $\beta$  *posuit*; while very often the difference is not in words, but only in the order in which they are written.

Is there any hope that it will ever be possible, in regard to the passages in which editors have been guided simply by individual preference, to attain, or even to approximate to certainty? If so, there are only two ways in which the object can be attained,—by an elaborate study of Caesar's diction, and by definitely settling the question whether either of the two families of MSS. is, on the whole, so superior to the other as to justify us, on this ground alone, in accepting its authority.

Meusel tells us, in the preface to his

edition, that, in deciding between different readings, he has carefully considered which harmonises with Caesar's *consuetudo dicendi*; and there can be no doubt that he, if any scholar, is qualified to undertake such an investigation. There are, however, many cases, especially as regards the order of words, in which this method appears inconclusive. For instance, in *B.G.*, ii. 17, 1, Mr. Du Pontet reads *locum idoneum castris*, and Meusel *locum castris idoneum*: v. 9, 1, vii. 35, 5 support the latter, while in i. 49, 1, vi. 10, 2, we find *castris idoneum locum*. In i. 26, 1, we have *diu atque acriter pugnatum est*; in iii. 21, 1, *pugnatum est diu atque acriter*, with no appreciable difference of meaning. In iv. 13, 4, and vii. 43, 2, no study of Caesar's *consuetudo dicendi* will enable us (see *Lex. Caes.*, ii. 1298) to decide between *sui purgandi* (causa) and *purgandi sui*.

Kübler, remarking that Orosius, in the early part of the fifth century, used a copy belonging to the  $\beta$  group, argues that we have 'in recensione  $\beta$  veterem vulgatum, multis sane locis corruptum textum, in recensione  $\alpha$  novum quemdam, a grammaticis illis (Lupicinus and Celsus), doctis certe et prudentibus purgatum ac perpolitum.' On the other hand, he maintains that the errors in  $\beta$  have arisen 'neglegentia librariorum, numquam interpolatorum fraude.' Finally, he tells us that, if he has not always followed  $\beta$  in doubtful passages, it is partly because he is convinced that Lupicinus and Celsus did not rely solely on their own skill as emendators, but also had recourse to old MSS. To which Mr. Du Pontet not unnaturally retorts that there could not be a stronger argument in favour of  $\alpha$ .

Now I confess that, after a careful examination of those passages in which  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  differ, I am convinced that where, by common consent,  $\alpha$  is wrong and  $\beta$  right, the errors in  $\alpha$  are nearly always due simply to carelessness on the part of the scribe. And it seems to me not less evident that in a considerable number of passages in which  $\beta$  is admitted to be in fault, the error is due to deliberate emendation. I have not space to enlarge upon these points, but would refer to the lists of passages on pp. 5—6, 14—16 of Walther's Programm.<sup>1</sup>

On the whole, then, it appears to me that, in those doubtful passages on which Caesar's *consuetudo dicendi* does not appear to throw light, there is a probability that  $\alpha$  has generally preserved the true reading. With

<sup>1</sup> I do not, however, think that all the passages which Walther quotes bear out his contention.

this qualification I am disposed to agree with Mr. Du Pontet. I will now proceed to indicate certain passages in which I think that he would have done well to have recourse to  $\beta$ .

In i. 40, 5, he reads (factum etiam nuper in Italia servili tumultu, quos tamen aliquid usus ac disciplina) *quae* (a nobis accepissent sublevarent). For *quae*  $\beta$  has *quam*, which seems preferable. Cf. C. Schneider, i. 87, and *Lex. Caes.*, ii. 1473.—i. 41, 3. Walther (pp. 16—17) gives a good reason for preferring *neque* (umquam) to *nec*.—i. 53, 6. *Videbat* is to be preferred to *viderat*, which is weak and pointless.—ii. 4, 7. *Summam totius belli* should be read instead of (suam,) *totius belli summam*, because (*Lex. Caes.*, ii. 71, 2046), *summa*, when used with *belli* and *imperii*, invariably precedes the genitive.—ii. 34. (In) *deditionem* (potestatemque populi Romani) should be rejected in favour of *dicionem*, because, as Walther (p. 19) points out, when words are closely connected by *que*, the genitive, if there is one, refers to them both.—In iii. 17, 2 (and various other passages) *eis*, as Walther (p. 19) remarks, ought surely to be *his*. The confusion is, of course, very common.—iii. 19, 5. *Caesar certior factus*. Here  $\alpha$  omits *est*, which  $\beta$  supplies; and such an ellipsis occurs nowhere else in the *Commentaries*.—v. 1, 2. (Ad onera,) *ad* (multitudinem) is surely wrong: for the second *ad*  $\beta$  has *ac*.—v. 8, 6. I find it difficult to believe that Caesar wrote (magnae manus . . . multitudine navium perterritae, quae cum annotinis privatisque quas) *sui quisque commodi* (fecerat). Such a construction, often as it occurs in Tacitus, is found nowhere else in Caesar. I believe that *sui quisque commodi causa*,<sup>1</sup> which is supported by *Lex. Caes.*, i. 487—90, is the right reading.—v. 11, 4. Mr. Du Pontet is, I believe, alone in reading (Labieno scribit ut quam plurimas) *posset* (. . . naves instituat), instead of *possit*.—v. 15, 1, *Equites . . . in itinere conflixerunt, tamen ut nostri . . . superiores fuerint*. *Ita*, which  $\beta$  supplies, is, as C. Schneider shows (ii. 71), required before *tamen*.—v. 29, 7. I believe that Mr. Du Pontet is alone in reading *si praesens periculum non* instead of *si non praesens periculum*. The emphasis falls, not upon *non* but upon *praesens*.—*Postera die*, which Mr. Du Pontet reads in v. 49, 5, ought certainly to be *postero die*, as anyone may convince himself by studying *Lex. Caes.*, i. 891—904, and especially pp. 897—8.—vii. 35, 1. (Cum uterque) *utrique esset*

<sup>1</sup> The order in  $\beta$ ,—*sui commodi quisque causa*,—is evidently wrong.

*exercitui* (in conspectu, fereque e regione castris castra poneret) is, I am convinced, preferable to *utrimque exisset exercitus*.—vii. 45, 7. A consideration of the circumstances of the case will lead us to prefer the reading of  $\beta$ , (Vacua castra hostium Caesar conspicatus, tectis insignibus suorum. . . raros milites) *ne* (ex oppido animadvertentur ex maioribus castris in minora traducit) to *qui*; for obviously Caesar's object was to prevent his soldiers from being noticed.—vii. 75, 1. In spite of Nipperdey's arguments, it is hard to believe that Caesar wrote (non omnes . . . convocandos statuant sed certum numerum cuique) *ex civitate* (imperandum). Surely we should read *civitati*.—vii. 78, 2. Mr. Du Pontet reads (illo tamen) *tempore* (potius utendum consilio). I am convinced that *tempore* is an interpolation. Cf. Walther, p. 15.

Let me now call attention to a few passages in which there is no question of any difference between  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ .—iii. 21, 1. I have no doubt that for *tamen* we should read *tandem* (confecti vulneribus hostes terga vertere), even though *tandem* is found only in one inferior MS. This I infer from the context and from *Lex. Caes.*, ii. 2114—5.—iv. 20, 4. (Itaque vocatis ad se undique mercatoribus. . . neque qui essent ad) *maiorum* (navium multitudinem idonei portus reperire poterat etc.). A moment's reflection on the circumstances of the case will show that we ought to read *maiorem*, even though there is no better authority for it than *E. Caesar* was not anxious to find out what harbours would accommodate a flotilla of large ships, but what harbours would accommodate a large flotilla. The ships were not large: their draught was so small that when they were aground, the men could jump overboard and wade ashore (iv. 24—5).—v. 49, 1. Is it credible that Caesar wrote (Galli . . . ad Caesarem cum omnibus copiis contendunt.) *Haec erant armatae* (circa milia LX.)? Whether he wrote *hae*, which is found in  $\phi\pi$  (I use Meusel's symbols), and *armatae*, which is found in all the MSS., or *haec* and *armata* (Nipperdey's conjecture), I will not attempt to decide.—In vii. 11, 2, I believe that Mr. Du Pontet has adopted an unnatural punctuation. He reads *Ea qui conficeret C. Trebonium legatum relinquit, ipse ut quam primum iter faceret. Cenabum Carnutum proficiscitur; qui tum primum etc.* What could be more abrupt? Why not read with Meusel what the obvious sense dictates,—*Ea qui. . . relinquit. Ipse, ut quam primum iter faceret (or conficeret), Cenabum Carnutum proficiscitur etc.*?—vii.



24, 1. *aggerem latum pedes CCCXXX, altum pedes LXXX. extruxerunt.* Mr. Du Pontet unnecessarily obelises *latum*; and he would not have proposed to substitute *latum* for *altum*, if he had understood the conditions which made it necessary to have a very wide and (in front) very high *agger* at Avaricum.

Regarding proper names I shall say very little, having dealt fully with the subject in another place. I am inclined to think that, in one or two cases, Mr. Du Pontet has been more anxious to give the true Latin form of Celtic names than to ascertain what Caesar wrote.<sup>1</sup> For instance, in view of the consensus of the MSS., he would, I think, have done well to write *Haedui* rather than *Aedui*. Moreover, as *Divitiacus*,—the form generally found in *a*,—is attested by the coins, it would have been well to adopt it in preference to *Divitiacus*.<sup>2</sup> I hold, with C. Schneider and Meusel, for reasons which I have given elsewhere, that, in i. 31, 12, we should read, not *Admagetobrigae*, but *ad Magetobrigam*. In v. 20, 1, it is not easy to decide between *Trinobantes*, which Mr. Du Pontet adopts, and *Trinovantes*: but Professor Rhys (*Celtic Britain*, 1884, p. 310) argues, rightly I believe, in favour of the latter. Again, in v. 24, 3, it is hard to say whether *Belgio* or *Belgis* is right; but the occurrence of the former in v. 25, 4, combined with various reasons which I have given in *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*, pp. 385-7, lead me to prefer it.

On other questions of orthography I have no room to do more than refer generally to Meusel's *Lexicon Caesarianum* and to Kübler's edition, pp. cxxi.-cxxx.

Mr. Du Pontet has shown his good sense by generally refusing to admit conjectural readings into his text without absolute necessity. Comparatively few of the passages in the *Gallie War* which it has been sought to amend really require emendation; and, for obvious reasons, the most skilful and ingenious emendator who goes to work upon the *Commentaries* can rarely hope to attain the certain, or morally certain, results that have rewarded the diligence of the best

scholars who have restored the text of, let us say, Plautus.<sup>3</sup>—In vii. 14, 5, Mr. Du Pontet adopts Madvig's simple, obvious, and almost convincing emendation, *ab via*, for *aboia* or *a boia*.—In vii. 35, 4, all critics agree that *captis* (*quibusdam cohortibus*) is nonsense. Between thirty and forty conjectures have been offered; in an exhaustive examination of the passage I have argued that only one of them, that of Wendel, *carptis* (*quibusdam cohortibus*), meets the case. Mr. Du Pontet, however, reads *apertis* (*quibusdam cohortibus*), which he attributes to Deiter: but what Deiter really wrote was *ita apertis*, etc. I may here remark that Mr. Du Pontet's *brevis adnotatio critica* appears to me rather too short. Readings from  $\beta$  are very often given silently; and this, in an edition in which the superiority of *a* is so emphatically insisted upon, is apt to mislead. I mention this because so many readings from  $\beta$  are given in the *adnotatio* that it is hard to understand on what principle others, equally important, have been omitted. To take one noteworthy instance, the reading *paene in eo* (vii. 21, 3) is left unrecorded.—In vii. 84, 1, Mr. Du Pontet is, I believe, mistaken in substituting *cratis*, the conjecture of Ursinus, for *castris*, the reading of *a*, and *a castris*, that of  $\beta$ . This point I have discussed on pp. 793-4 of my own book. But what surprises me is that Mr. Du Pontet, while adopting the conjectures which I have noted, rejects, alone among all the modern editors whom I have ever heard of, one of the very few absolutely certain emendations which are to be found in Meusel's *Tabula Coniecturarum*, and even omits to record it in his *adnotatio critica*. I refer to Nicasius's emendation, *praeerat* for *praeerant* in i. 16, 5. It is true that M. Robert Mowat endeavoured, some years ago, to deduce from a coin of the Lexovii the conclusion that the MS. reading was correct: but his interpretation of the legend on the coin was demolished by MM. P. Ch. Robert, E. Ernault and other numismatists; and on pp. 517-9 of *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul* I have proved that only one Vergobret held office in each year, and that the true reading is *praeerat*.

T. RICE HOLMES.

<sup>1</sup> On this question the remarks of Kübler (pp. cxx.-cxxi.) are worth reading.

<sup>2</sup> I have myself, like Mr. Du Pontet, adopted the form *Divitiacus*, and also *Aduatuci* and *Aduatua*, instead of *Atuatuci* and *Atuatua*: but, as I was not editing the *Commentaries*, I took these liberties, and in various other instances adopted the familiar instead of the correct forms of proper names, for a reason which I have explained on pp. 811-812 of *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*.

<sup>3</sup> As some of my German reviewers, for whose informing and helpful criticisms of my own book I am not less grateful than for the favourable opinions which they have so generously expressed, have taken me to task for what I wrote on p. xviii. about conjectural emendation, I may be allowed to point out that my remarks were directed not against the use but against the abuse of conjecture.

## LUCIAN MUELLER'S ODES AND EPODES OF HORACE.

Q. Horatius Flaccus, *Oden und Epoden*; erklärt von LUCIAN MUELLER. 2 vols. Pp. 319 and 497. Published by R. L. Ricker, St. Petersburg and Leipzig, 1900. M. 16.

THE eminent scholar, who by this work wins a fresh title to the respect of all students of Latin, died at St. Petersburg in April 1898 leaving his task incomplete. The present volumes consist (1) of the text, (2) of Introductions to each Ode, and (3) of Notes. They have been edited with great care by G. Goetz, who states that proofs of a considerable portion had already been revised by the author, while the MS of the remainder was ready for the press; but that the fourth part, which consisted of a general Introduction, was not in a sufficiently advanced state to admit of publication.

It may be said generally that the book is a notable addition to Horatian literature, and deserves a place in every classical library. Disputed points are lucidly dealt with; grammatical questions are well handled and without those terrible references to sections and sub-sections in the authorities which make some notes look like a Law Report; rare words are illustrated by short and effective quotations; the Greek sources of many phrases are indicated with great accuracy and learning, while almost everywhere the commentary exhibits taste, judgement, and originality of thought.

In 3, 4, 38, for instance, the editor reads *abdidit oppidis*, pointing out that there is no reference to any final settlement of dismissed veterans in military colonies (which is the assumption on which *abdidit* is justified) but to the ordinary *retirement* of the troops into winter-quarters, while Augustus in consequence was able to devote himself to those literary studies for which—according to Horace—he so eagerly longed. “Think, for example, of Frederick the Great,” says the editor, and in half-a-dozen words throws more light on the point than all previous notes on the subject put together. On *unicis Sabinis* (2, 18, 14) he rightly rejects Haupt’s dictum that a *farm* in any district can be described by the name of the people of that district. Haupt, with apparent aptitude, quotes Mart. 10, 44, 9 *sed reddare tuis tandem mansure Sabinis*, but neglects to quote the first line *Quinte Caledonios Oridi viure Britannos*, which shews that Martial

reproaches Ovidius with leaving his ‘Sabine friends and neighbours’ to visit northern barbarians. Similarly he quotes Ovid Am. 2, 16, 37, *non ego Paelignos videor celebrare salubres*, as though *Pael. sal.* were = ‘my health-giving farm among the Paeligni,’ but does not quote line 39 *sed Scythiam Cilicasque feros viridesque Britannos*, where the last two words should on his theory = ‘a verdant estate in Britain.’ The fact is that a person may be said ‘to visit Britain’ or ‘the Britons,’ and an affected writer like Pliny says that he is going in *Tuscos meos* (Mayor on Pl. 3, 4, 2) when he merely means ‘to my Tuscan estate,’ but when a poet speaks of *unicis Sabinis* he can only mean ‘the Sabines who are all in all to him,’ so that he wants nothing more. Doubtless when Horace uses the phrase he refers to his Sabine farm, but he does so, as a poet should, by saying that he holds *the people* who live there very dear. Mueller unfortunately spoils his just criticism of Haupt by wishing to read *unico Sabino*, which is excellent prose but bad poetry.

On *fine destinata* (2, 18, 29) the agreement of *fine* and *destinata* is rightly regarded as certain, and a valuable reference given to Serv. on Aen. 6, 152 who explains *f. d.* of the tomb, though, as one good MS gives the quotation with *sede* for *fine*, while *tres codices Cruquiani* were also said to have *sede*, and *sede destinata* Tac. Ann. 1, 8 seems an echo of Horace, it is not improbable that *sede* should be read here. Anyhow either *sede* or *fine* is good, and ‘the destined dwelling’ or ‘goal of the grave’ is the clear meaning of a passage, about which commentators have created much needless trouble.

In 1, 1, 3 the odd phrase *curriculo pulverem collegisse* is rightly said to be used ‘ironically’ for *curru certare*, since irony is a distinct characteristic of Horace, and the recognition of it in 1, 6, 6 would have prevented the editor from accepting the censure which the grammarian Charisius passes on the rendering of *μῆνιν*...*Ἀχιλλῆος οὐλομένην* by *gravem Pelidae stomachum*. The repetition of *Telephi* 1, 13, 1, is provided with a close parallel from Archilochus 69 (*νῦν δὲ Λεωφίλος μὲν ἄρχει, Λεωφίλος δ’ ἐπικρατεῖ, Λεωφίλῳ δ’ ἐπ’ πάντα κόηται, Λεωφίλον δ’ ἀκούεται*), but the exact point of the ‘special emphasis’ given to the name is not made clear as it should be. In 2, 1, 10 ‘*desit theutris*: ein feines

Lob für Pollio' is excellent criticism, and so is that on *servare* 2, 3, 2, 'Man achte auf dies Wort, durch dessen Wahl Horaz den Verdacht des Moralpredigers vermeidet. Dellius besitzt schon die *mens aequa*, braucht sie nicht zu erwerben.' Or again on 3, 25, 2 *quae nemora aut quos agor in specus* the omission of the first *in* is excellently dealt with, while in the noted difficulty *immunis aram*... 3, 23, 17-20 nothing could be better than the treatment. The word *immunis* is the key to the problem, and my own rendering 'without a gift' is certainly wrong, for Phidyle had at least offered a pig. The word is used 'in a legal sense' (cf. *ager immunis, cives immunes*); Phidyle was not under any debt or obligation to the gods, but of her own free will makes her humble offering, which is for that reason more acceptable than the 'costly victims' of those who seek by such means to 'wheedle' (cf. *blandior*) forgiveness from the gods.

The point of the description *quae Liris quietu | mordet aqua taciturnus amnis* (1, 31, 7), is justly indicated; it is the repose of the district which makes the weary business man long for it. Exception is taken to explaining *ne* in 1, 33, 1 *Albi, ne doleas* and 2, 4, 1 *ne sit ancillae*... as = 'lest,' for the result of doing so, in obedience to grammatical pedantry, produces 'eine ungeheuerliche Periode.' *Placare*... *deos* (1, 36, 2), which seems to us an odd phrase to use when celebrating a banquet for a soldier's safe return, is well referred to the ancient belief that it is in the hour of prosperity that the jealous gods specially need 'appeasing.'

The instances thus selected, somewhat at random, will suffice to shew the merits of the commentary; but, unhappily, an edition of this character raises other questions of such importance to the welfare of classical study that it is impossible not to consider them. 'With the dead,' doubtless, 'there is no controversy,' but I shall criticize the method rather than the man, and the present editor represents a body of scholars who are now so supreme that a simple school-master who tilts against them need hardly fear the reproach of attacking the defenceless.

The mere notes, then, in this edition fill 497 pages, which, though slightly smaller than the pages of the *Classical Review*, yet probably, owing to the size of the type, contain considerably more matter. They are moreover not discursive but concise. It is impossible to skim them, and to read them through is a very lengthy process even for

one who is comparatively an expert in Horace. That any poet, who is worth reading, can need to be elucidated or obscured by such a mass of comment is *prima facie* absurd. Least of all can this be so in the case of a poet who is as transparently clear as Horace is in three-fourths of the Odes, while anyone who knows the editions of Nauck and Kiessling will be aware that practically all which is best worth knowing on the subject may be adequately represented in a very limited space. There are a certain number of difficulties which, except some new MS should be discovered, are likely to prove difficulties until the end of time. No one, for example, has as yet found any real solution of *iam virum expertae*... or of *venena magnum fas nefasque*... Commentators and emendators have merely made such puzzles more puzzling, and the best editor is the man who states the difficulty in its simplest form, quotes half-a-dozen conjectures in order to shew their absurdity, and then leaves the problem unsolved. Except as an amusement for specialists, such passages have little real interest, and do not concern ordinary readers more than the trisection of an angle does a boy learning Euclid.

Unfortunately, however, because in some places MSS are corrupt and unintelligible, and because a certain number of brilliant emendations have been made, it has become the fashion to examine the text of some ancient writers, if not with the view, at least with the hope of finding some novelty of reading or interpretation. In the case of Horace Bentley set a notable example. He did, indeed, much admirable work at a time when texts were generally bad, but he also did much which only deserves a kind oblivion. His emendations of Milton are a permanent proof of the difference which may exist between a critic and a poet, and his emendations of Horace are often no whit better. When he writes *capacis Orci* for *rapacis Orci* he merely makes a bad pun; when he alters *emirabitur insolens* into *ut mirabitur insolens* he stirs the open-mouthed wonder he objects to; when he proposes *postque equitem sedet atra Cura* adding '*mollius, opinor, fluet versus*,' you ask what his ideas of euphony were. Anybody might make such alterations, but it needs a certain self-confidence to publish them. Bentley, however, was Master of Trinity, a royal Chaplain, and Archdeacon of Ely, so that, along with his vast erudition, he overawed and still overawes the human mind. On the continent he reigns supreme; he is practically the one Englishman who a German editor will con-

descend to refer to. But his reputation has raised him up rivals, and Peerlkamp has notoriously outrun him in the attempt to re-write Horace. The consequence is that to arrive at the real Horace in an edition where the names of Bentley and Peerlkamp perpetually appear is an almost hopeless task. The simplest Odes become unintelligible, the plainest words dubious, and the happiest phrases corrupt.

To make such statements may seem the language of exaggeration, but at least some of the evidence shall be submitted. The ordinary reader, who merely enjoys Horace, will find that he has much to learn.

1, 12, 37-43 are marked as not genuine. Peerlkamp struck out 33-48, but M. Haupt and the editor are more modest. The words *animaeque magnae* | *prodigum Paulum superante Poeno* are apparently not good Latin. It is allowed to be 'scarcely disputable' that Juvenal 11, 90 refers to these stanzas, and that Claudian 'after the stanza by an unknown author had slipped into the text' imitates the use of *prodigum* by writing *intumuit virtus et lucis prodigum arsit* | *impetus*. The interpolator who could deceive Juvenal and Claudian must have been a remarkable man; but he could not deceive Peerlkamp.

1, 13, 2 for *cerea Telephi brachia* the reading *lactea* is given against all MSS evidence on the authority of *vetustissimus grammaticus Flavius Caper*, and thus one *grammaticus* repeats the errors of another *grammaticus* from age to age. Why Telephus should not have arms 'like wax' those who choose can see in Bentley, who playfully asks whether he had 'the jaundice.' That his beauty was of the 'wax doll' order is a suggestion from the nursery which may now be more intelligible at Cambridge.

1, 20, 5 for *care Maecenas eques* Bentley with some unknown MS of course reads *clare*, and *care eques* is declared by Mueller to be 'abgeschmackt.' This is one of those emendations which is sure to be made, and would not deserve mentioning did it not shew how the taste for this sort of thing grows. In *Epod. 3, 20* Horace ventured to write *iocose Maecenas*, but now we have *iocosa, Maecenas, precor* | *manum puella savio opponat tuo*. 'After the pathetic though apparently satirical tone of what precedes' to call Maecenas *iocosus* would be out of place, and then follows proof of how well the epithet fits *puella*. Markland and Peerlkamp claim the credit of this discovery.

1, 24, 5 *cui Pudor et Justitiae soror* | *in-corrupta Fides*; so Horace, but this edition

has *et Justitia et soror* 'with Peerlkamp after Waddel,' for Justice is the chief of virtues and 'cannot possibly' be mentioned as it were 'casually' (beiläufig). Etiquette should come first and poetry afterwards.

1, 31, 5 the *grata Calabriae armenta* become *lata*. To speak of flocks or herds as *grata* = 'lieblich' is, it seems, 'bad taste.' Of course, too, in line 9 *Calenam* is read because the MSS evidence is wholly for *Calena*, while line 12 appears as *vina sua reparata merces*. It would be difficult to produce a worse adjective than *sua*, but then Peerlkamp and Meineke agree that stanzas 3 and 4 of this Ode are *omnis generis ineptiis repletas* and to save them they must be improved. The merchant who goes to the *aequor Atlanticum* 'three or four times a year' in line 14 cannot possibly drink wine 'bought in exchange for Syrian merchandise,' but to preserve his credit as an honest man it is fitting that we should know that the merchandise was 'his own.'

1, 37, 14 *mentemque lymphatam Marsetico* and 4, 17, 17 *spectandus in certamine Martio* are obelized as violating the laws of metre. They certainly do so, and are certainly right. The first reflects in its striking rhythm the haste and enthusiasm with which the splendid Ode where it occurs was thrown off. The second is as fine an instance of deliberate violation of rule in order to produce marked effect as can be found in any Latin poet—

'Great wits sometimes may gloriously offend  
And rise to faults true critics dare not mend.'

As, however, space is an object, I must be content with merely mentioning many other instances. In 2, 3, 7 *per dies festos* is obelized and so too *quo pinus* . . . ? 2, 5, 12 *purpureo varius* becomes *varios*; while *quos tibi demperit apponet annos* becomes *quod . . . annus*. 2, 6, 18 *amicus Aulon* is of course turned into *amictus*. 2, 8, 2 poor *Barine* is obelized; her name is 'leider ebenso verderbt wie ihre Sitten'; *Barcine, Barsine, Larine*, and *Carine* are suggested for her, and the wonderful stanza beginning *adde quod pubes tibi crescit omnis* is mutilated into *adde quod pubes, ubi crescit, omnis*. 2, 11, 15 *canos odorati capillos* becomes *cinctos*, and 2, 13, 1 *ille et nefasto* appears as *vilem nefasto*. 2, 14, 6 *amice* is printed but in the notes Peerlkamp's view that it is 'superfluous' is approved and the editor suggests *iam rite*, adding the delicious comment 'hier wäre *iam* kein Flickwort (stopgap).' 2, 15, 8 *domino priori* is altered to *priorem*, which few will be able to construe; 2, 16, 29 in



*abstulit clarum cita mors Achillem* the last word is obelized, for what reason few will be able to guess. 3, 1, 33-40 are not genuine; so too 3, 21-24, 4, 69-72, while 3, 3, 18 *Ilion, Ilion* ought to be 'something like *Ilion inpium*.' In lines 37-40 of the same Ode there are two marks of obelization which any reader will find it a pretty puzzle to place correctly, and in line 46 *medius liquor* appears as *modicus liquor*. 3, 4, 46 *et urbes regnaque tristitia* is *et umbras*; 3, 5, 8 *in armis* is *in arvis*; 3, 5, 17 *periret* is *perires*, while in 3, 6, 22 *matura virgo* turns up as *acerba virgo*! Even that flawless gem the *amoebaeic* ninth Ode is not sacred; the line *relectaeque patet ianua Lydiae* is obelized. It appears that *Lydiae* is a genitive; decorum demands that Horace should call on Lydia, and not *vice versa*, and therefore, 'as the elder Burmann suggested,' we ought to read *si flava excutitur Chloe, relectaene patet ianua Lydiae*? 'If I give up Chloe, is (hier steht ne in emphatischer Frage) Lydia willing to be "at home" when I call?'

But enough! I had collected 30 or 40 more similar instances; those, however, which I have referred to will satisfy all ordinary students. There are good emendations, of which Bentley's *dedicet Euro* (1, 25, 20) for *dedicet Hebro* is an excellent specimen. There are too plausible emendations like *vepris inhorrui ad ventum foliis* (1, 23, 5), or like *Marsi peditis* for *Mauri* (1, 2, 39), although personally I think that Horace is depicting a fierce-eyed blackamoor (some figure like 'the Turk's Head' which used to glare from sign-boards), and that all considerations of the Moors being horsemen and the Marsi famous warriors are beside the question. Again, to suggest *fama Marcellis* for the MS *fama Marcelli* or *maior an illa* for *maior an illi* is reasonable, but what can be said for printing (3, 14, 14)

*ego nunc tumultum  
nunc mori per vim metuum tenente  
Caesare terras*

or for stating that in *te duce Caesar*, the fine ending of 1, 2, the word *Caesar* is not genuine? In the last case the editor quietly says 'Doch ist die Besserung kaum möglich,' and indeed, if anyone will blot out *Caesar* and then try and 'find the missing word,' he will discover that he has entered upon a very difficult competition.

It is certainly time that this arbitrary criticism of Horace, which erases or emends whatever displeases the critic's taste, should be relegated to a secondary place in Horatian study. It is stifling real and

living acquaintance with him as a great poet. His text is buried under a mass of comment as effectively as the simple teaching of the Synoptic Gospels is entombed under a portentous pile of theological literature. The scholarship which is needed is that scholarship which is strong enough to relegate technicalities to their proper place and to devote itself to the real elucidation of a great writer.

At present, however, the only way to obtain any credit for classical learning is to study manuscripts, scholiasts and lexicographers; the sure road to immortality is to sit down and see whether some word, which is *prima facie* genuine, cannot be altered into some word which closely resembles it in appearance (e.g. *rapidus rabidus, totum tutum, atra arta, alto arto, puro duro, puellis duellis*). The editor, on the other hand, who merely tries to make clear what Horace meant is certain of oblivion. I might prove the point by referring to the total silence with which the work of a scholar so skilful and sympathetic as Dr. Wickham is passed over in the present edition, but I prefer to be egotistic, for, after all, to avoid the word 'I' in writing is a mere trick of style, and a man can only state what he knows himself, while 'The Confessions of a classical Editor' may at least provoke some interest on the ground of rarity.

It was my fortune, chiefly by accident, some twenty years ago to edit the Odes. At that time I was totally ignorant of Bentley; I knew absolutely nothing about MSS; about scholiasts, editors, and emendators I cared not one jot. My sole qualification for my task was that I knew the Odes thoroughly, admired them exceedingly, and could write a decent imitation of them with facility. Since then I have read and made notes on an enormous mass of Horatian literature, so that at the present time I am, in a muddled sort of way, what may be termed an expert on the subject. But in my own heart I am well aware that my real knowledge of Horace, my real power of understanding him is less now than it was in 1880. If I had to edit the Odes afresh to-day I am satisfied that the edition would be technically superior to what I produced long ago, and also intrinsically worse. It would have fewer blunders and fewer merits, because my mind is now so encumbered with a mass of miscellaneous information, mostly worthless, that it can no longer act with native and necessary freshness. My intimacy with Horace has ceased; my

intimacy with critics, who never could have written one of his Odes, has become a sad reality. I am becoming a 'scholar' in name exactly because I am ceasing to be so in fact.

Moreover, amid all the bulk of comment which I have now read, what excites surprise is the exceedingly minute proportion of anything which is really valuable. Book after book comes to me and I read it with a natural desire to find something which I may use to improve my own notes. Anything worth having I am selfishly eager to appropriate, but unfortunately I find very little that I care to steal. My edition remains a small book not because I could not long since have made it a large one, but because I cannot find anything more to put in it. 'This little School-book' is consequently the remark generally made about it by critics who weigh literature by pounds avoirdupois, while scholars agree that one who prefers Horace to what the *grammaticorum turba* has said about him is unworthy of serious discussion. Yet surely even German erudition might recognize a poor Englishman's work rather than assert that *tenebit* in 1, 7, 21, is 'corrupt' and suggest that *latebris* 'might do' in its place. Or again when it is said that *redemptor frequens cum famulis* 3, 1, cannot mean 'with a throng of workmen,' a reference which I give to Ter. Andria 1, 1, 81, *cum illis qui amabant Chrysidem una aderat frequens* might serve to prove the opposite. The use of *notus animi paterni* (2, 2, 5) as = 'noted for affection' is allowed to be unparalleled in Horace (for 4, 13, 21 is

rightly explained otherwise) but surely the explanation of *animi paterni* as a simple gen. of quality deserves notice. Macaulay's illustration of *incedis per ignes | suppositos cineri doloso* as an image drawn from walking 'on the thin crust of ashes beneath which the lava is still glowing' deserves a place in any notes. A knowledge of Wickham's school edition (p. 330) would make even a boy recognize the folly of altering 3, 4, 46 *urbes regnaque tristia* into *umbras*. The explanation of *tuis ignibus* 3, 7, 11 as = Gyges, though this use of *ignis* 'is not found elsewhere in Horace,' and the use of the plural seems altogether exceptional, would surely be modified by fuller acquaintance with the problem. A glance at Milton's phrase

'A multitude, like which the frozen North  
Poured never from her frozen loins,'  
might give a critic pause before he condemned *Germania quos horrida parturit fetus* as 'abgeschmackt,' so that *motus* is preferable, or indeed the whole stanza should be rejected.

There are numerous other instances where the editor might at least have learnt something from several English commentators on Horace. I do not for one moment maintain that their views or my own have any special merit, but I respectfully submit that they deserve consideration, and that the emendations, erasures and obelizations of Bentley, Peirlkamp and similar critics are not the only part of classical study which deserves to rank as real scholarship.

T. E. PAGE.

#### BRIEFER NOTICES.

*Adversaria Critica in Sophoclem.* By F. H. M. BLAYDES. Halis Saxonum. 1900. 6 Mk.

THIS volume is a supplement to the author's edition of Sophocles and is similar in scope and character to his *Adversaria* on Aristophanes which were noticed recently in this *Review*. It contains a large number of fresh conjectures by Mr. Blaydes himself, together with a selection of conjectures made by others and readings from the Paris codices 2787, 2886, 2711. The notes are interesting and useful but the survey of the field of Sophoclean criticism is tantalisingly incomplete. Hardly any account is taken of Jebb's recently published editions.

F. W. HALL.

*Onomasticum Taciteum* composuit PHILIPPUS FABIA. Annales de l'Université de Lyon II. Droit, Lettres; fascicule 4. Paris: Fontemoing, 1900. Pp. 772. 8vo. 15 francs.

THIS handsomely printed volume is what it professes to be, neither more nor less. It contains all the proper names occurring in the works of Tacitus, with all the passages where they occur appended in full or nearly in full, and some brief footnotes exhibiting manuscript variants or conjectures of importance. It is therefore more than an index: on the other hand, it makes no attempt to give biographies of persons named or indications of books where bio-

graphies may be found, except an occasional reference to the 'Prosopographia.' It is simply a book which shews at a glance everything which can be learnt from Tacitus about any person or place, and it justifies its existence on the ground that such a book possesses an undoubted convenience in use. So far as I have been able to ascertain, it

has been compiled with great care and accuracy. In two cases, in respect to the forms of the names Decangi (Ceangi, Cangi) and Trisantonæ (Antona, Avona), the author has somewhat overlooked the latest and best conclusions.

F. HAVERFIELD.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### THE ENGLISH PROSPECTUS OF THE THESAURUS LINGUAE LATINAE.

It is gratifying to find that Messrs. Teubner have taken in good part the criticisms passed here and elsewhere on the English Translation of the Prospectus of the New Thesaurus. They have gone to the trouble and expense of entirely rewriting it, and the result, with one or two exceptions,

is a piece of good printing and clear English. It is to be hoped that their promptness and enterprise will meet with the success they deserve, and that many copies of the Thesaurus will be sold in English-speaking countries.

RONALD M. BURROWS.

### SEATON'S APOLLONIUS RHODIUS.

DR. PEILE, in his friendly notice of my text of Apollonius Rhodius, in the February number of the *Classical Review*, has somewhat misrepresented my meaning in the following passage, no doubt through a hasty perusal of one sentence in my preface. He writes of me, 'he says he assigns more weight than Merkel did to the two Vatican codices: but where he follows them in any

reading, Merkel (so far as I have observed) had done the same.' A reference however to the sentence in question will show that my remark applied not to two of the Vatican codices but to the five Parisian. Examples of what I state may be found *passim* and especially near the beginning of the fourth book.

R. C. SEATON.

## REPORTS.

### OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

On Thursday, January 24th, a paper was read by Mr. ARTHUR EVANS, the keeper of the Ashmolean Museum, on the newly discovered Cretan Script. The writer showed how an original pictorial system of writing, which was in vogue in the island at a very early period, developed in Mycenaean times into an advanced linear alphabet of which some of the signs may throw light on the origin of some of the non-Phoenician letters in the Greek alphabet.

On Friday, February 8th, critical notes on Aristotle were read by Mr. GROSE of Queen's College, who (1) defended the mention of Phalaris in Ar. Eth. vii. 5, 7, against Mr. Burnet's comments by referring to

the citation from Clearchus in Athenaeus  $\theta$  396  $\epsilon$ ; (2) interpreted  $\piαραδοξα ελέγχειν$  in Ar. Eth. vii. 2, 8, from the view that  $ελέγχειν$  is here used in its ordinary Aristotelian sense, as the exposure of absurdities which necessarily follow from an opponent's theses. He referred to such passages as Sophist. El. cc. 3 and 12, and Topics viii. 4.

Notes were also read by Mr. J. A. SMITH of Balliol College on Post. Anal. I. i.  $\S$  4: de Anim. iii. x. (especially 433<sup>a</sup> 31 sequ.): Poet. iv.  $\S$  11, viii.  $\S$  3, ix.  $\S$  15: and on the term  $\muερόντης$ .

On Friday, Feb. 15th, Mr. B. W. HENDERSON, of Merton College, read a paper on 'The site of

Tigranocerta." After presenting all the evidence on the controversy to be found in the ancient authorities, he concluded that these fell into two main classes, the one championing a site in Northern Mesopotamia, the other one in Armenia proper. The evidence for and against the four suggested sites of Diarbekr, Sert, Tel Abad, and Tel Ermen was then discussed, and the conclusion reached that Sachau's suggestion of Tel Ermen satisfies the superior class of the ancient authorities and is on many grounds definitely to be preferred to its three rivals.

On Feb. 22nd Mr. A. C. CLARK, of Queen's College, read a paper upon some fresh material for the criticism of the letters to Atticus obtained from marginalia found in two printed books in the Bibliothèque Nationale. One of these contains the rough notes of Turnebus, afterwards published in his *Adversaria*, and a collection made by him of the *Tornaesianus* (z) for ad Atticum xiv.-xvi. The other contains an interesting statement by Baluze concerning the Crusellinus of Bosius. An article dealing with the subjects of the paper will appear in the *Philologus*.

Mr. F. MADAN, of B.N.C., read a paper on Dr. Thomas James's *Canons of Textual Criticism*, as printed in his *Explication of his Supplication* (Oxford, 1605, 4to.). Dr. James, who was the first Librarian of the Bodleian, and a considerable controversialist on the Protestant side, had petitioned the authorities of the Church for the establishment of a small College of Theological Students who should examine critically the texts of the Fathers. This 'Supplication' he explains and justifies in the treatise mentioned above, and incidentally draws out a code of critical rules, which are, if not the earliest, certainly a very early set of formulated canons. These were read out and commented on. The general impression left was that Palaeography in the modern sense, as concerned with the *ductus litterarum* and sequence of styles of writing, was almost entirely absent, and that there was no grasp of the sources of error in transcription, such as now supplies a basis for their correction. The remarks on the limits of conjectural emendation and on the weight rather than mere number of MSS. were sound. In the discussion which ensued some doubt was expressed as to whether the rules represented the whole of the intellectual equipment of the Textual Critic of the time.

On Friday, March 1st, a paper was read by Prof. MACDONELL 'On the Reciprocal Relations of Greece and India in Speculation and Culture.'—After comparing the far-reaching influence on civilisation of ancient Greece in the West and of ancient India in the Farther East, and mentioning some points in which the culture of mediaeval Europe had been affected by India, the paper proceeded to indicate the reciprocal influences of Greece and India during the six centuries before and the four centuries after Christ. Before the two peoples came into contact they had borrowed their writing from the same Semitic source. Intercourse first became possible during the Persian dominion (500-331 B.C.) in the north-west of India; then came the invasion of Alexander (327 B.C.), followed by the sway of Greek rulers in the North-West for nearly two centuries (200-20 B.C.); after this a lively trade was carried on between Alexandria and Barygaza on the West Coast of India during the first centuries of our era. It was pointed out that there are certain resemblances between the Greek and the Sanskrit Epics, but that the Greek influence which has been traced here by some scholars is an unproved assumption.—With regard to the drama, it was stated

that while its origin is almost undoubtedly indigenous, it may have adopted some elements from the new Attic Comedy. A certain number of Aesopian fables were indicated as so unmistakably allied to those of early Sanskrit literature, that borrowing must have taken place on one side or the other; but the question of priority appears to be by no means settled as yet. Again, Greek and Indian philosophy had many points in common. In the Vedānta system, developed before 500 B.C., were found some of the leading doctrines of the Eleatics—that God and the universe are one, that the multiplicity of phenomena has no reality, that thinking and being are identical. Again, the Sāṅkhya doctrine of the eternity and indestructibility of matter were the exact counterpart of the doctrine of Empedocles. It was historically possible that the early Greek philosophers were influenced by Indian thought through Persia. Moreover, nearly all the doctrines attributed to Pythagoras, religious, philosophical, and mathematic, were known in India in the 6th century B.C., especially the doctrine of metempsychosis. Their dependence on Indian philosophy seemed highly probable.

There was, further, considerable similarity between the neo-Platonist philosophy of the 3rd century A.D. and the doctrines of the Sāṅkhya system. Prof. Garbe, the leading authority on the Sāṅkhya philosophy, considered Indian influence to be certain in this case; but some authorities on Greek philosophy thought that all the neo-Platonic doctrines could be explained as independently developed from purely Greek sources. The influence of Indian philosophy on Christian Gnosticism in the second and third centuries appeared to be undoubted.

The Indians, who were the great calculators of antiquity, the inventors of the numerical figures with which the whole world reckons, and of the decimal system, arrived at results in algebra, as well as arithmetic, beyond anything attempted by the Greeks; but they seem to have exercised no influence on the latter in this domain. On the other hand, the points of contact in geometry between the Greeks, the great geometers of antiquity, and the Indians, were so considerable that borrowing on the part of the Indians after 100 B.C. seemed likely. Astronomy was the only science in which strong Greek influence could be proved with certainty. Greek astronomy was introduced in the 4th century A.D. into India, and with it the naming of the days of the week after sun, moon, and planets, in the same order. Greek influence on Indian medical science was not improbable, as some close parallels had been discovered between the works of Hippocrates and Charaka (probably 1st century A.D.).

In the graphic and plastic arts influence was exercised from the Greek side only. The earlier Indian coins had consisted merely of punch-marked square pieces of metal; but after the 3rd century A.D. Indian coins artistically represented Zeus with aegis and thunderbolt, Heracles with club, Poseidon with trident, Athene with owl or eagle, and bore clear inscriptions in Greek as well as Indian characters. Greek art further left its mark on Indian Buddhist sculpture and architectural ornament, notably in the remains of the kingdom of Gandhāra (in the North-West), where its influence lasted from about 1-400 A.D.; but it might also be traced at Mathurā on the Jumna, at Buddha Gayā in Behar, and at Amarāvati on the Kistna river in the South-East. Through the example of the Greeks the Buddhists became the first builders in stone and brick in India. These structures imitated earlier wooden architecture and in plan retained an essentially national type throughout; it was only the ornamentation that was considerably affected by Greek influence.



On Friday, March 8th, a paper was read by Mr. FARNELL, of Exeter College, on the ethnographic problems presented by the Poseidon cults in Greece. If the name of the deity contains the root that appears in *ποτόν* and *πόσις*, a derivation that does not clash with any etymological law, then he may be regarded as one of the divinities brought into Greece by the earliest Aryan conquerors. At least, there is no clear trace of a non-Aryan element in his worship; for the occasional instances of female ministration are of no value as proof of this. The earliest ethnography of Greece and the prehistoric movements of tribes can only be gathered from a critical estimate of the evidence from cult, legend, genealogies and place-names. The strongest evidence is that which is gathered from cult; the weakest is that which is derived from mere genealogies. The cumulative argument drawn from these four sources points to Thessaly as the earliest home of this worship, and to the Minyans and Ionians as the earliest Hellenic tribes that diffused it. Wherever we find the worship prominent, wherever Poseidon was connected with the tribal or political organisation as *φράτριος*, *Γενέθλιος* or *Βασιλεύς*, we discover traces of Thessalian, Minyan or Ionic settlement or influence. The most important special cult for Greek ethnography is that of Poseidon-Hippios. Among the various suggested explanations, the most probable is that the horse was the embodiment of the water-spirit. The cult and the legend is specially prominent in Thessaly, and wherever we find it elsewhere in Greece we find also legends that seem to point back to Thessaly or Boeotia. And the cult acquired a new significance at an early time through the development of the art of horsemanship in Thessaly. It is probable that the Minyan settlements in Boeotia bordered on a very early Ionic. The worship of Poseidon *Ἐλικώνιος*, the political bond of the Ionic cities in Asia Minor, must have belonged to the Ionians before the migration. It is impossible to derive the title from Helike, or immediately from any other word but Helikon. And it is most natural to believe that this was the mountain (or stream) in Boeotia, especially as vestiges of Poseidon cult or legend survived in the vicinity. The great ethnographic importance of the worship of Helikionios, as supporting the hypothesis that Boeotia was an early home of the aboriginal Ionian stock, has hitherto been ignored. Possibly the 'Aegidae', 'the

sons of Aegeus' at Thebes belonged to an early Ionic settlement there. For Aigeus, the father of Theseus, is Poseidon himself, the title in all probability designating the God of Aegae. *Ποσειδῶν Πατήρ* at Eleusis should be interpreted not as 'the Father of Artemis,' but, in accordance with the analogy of similar titles, as 'the Father' of a local clan: and certain Eleusinian legends associate the region with Boeotia and North Greece. Poseidon on the Isthmus is connected with Ionic and Boeotian legend. The Argolid worship belongs to the Ionic settlement that preceded the Dorian there, and is associated with the name of Theseus. The Amphictyony of Kalauria is partly Minyan and partly Ionic. In the Laconian worship the Minyan tradition is especially strong. Around the Arcadian Poseidon and the sites of his worship in that country cluster many legends that carry us back to Thessaly. The proof of Minyan migration to Elis is indubitable, the story of Salmoneus and his mimicry of thunder reminding us of a rite of rain-magic attested of Thessaly. The cult in Achaia is Ionian, and, though preserved, was shorn of its prestige after the invasion of the Achaeans from the north. The old Minyan cult at Pylos in Messene was utterly obliterated by the Dorians, who never showed any strong leaning to Poseidon-worship. The same ethnic affinities can be traced, as we follow the track of Poseidon across the Aegean and along the Asia Minor coast.

The study of the cult is of the greatest importance for the early ethnography of Attica. A review of all the evidence appears to lead to the conclusion—opposed to recent theories—that Athena-worship is the primary religious fact with which we have to reckon in the earliest period of the existence of Athens; that Erechtheus the 'ground-breaker' (*ἐρεχθόνιος* = *ἐρεχθιχθόνιος*) is an aboriginal agricultural hero, a buried ancestor, that the introduction of Poseidon-worship was the result of an early Ionic migration—probably from Troezen—associated with the names of Theseus and Aegeus; and that the cult may have received additional stimulus from a somewhat later settlement of Pylian Minyans; that by a fictitious arrangement for political purposes the God is blended with the primitive ancestor, with whose real nature he has little or no affinity; and that the cult-title of Poseidon-Erechtheus is of later growth, analogous to that of Zeus-Agamemnon, Apollo Sarpedonios.

## ARCHAEOLOGY

### SOME RECENT WORKS ON CLASSICAL ART.

#### A.—GREEK SCULPTURE.

- (1) *Die Naturwiedergabe in der älteren griechischen Kunst*, von EMANUEL LOEWY. Rome 1900. (Loescher & Co.). 3 M. 60.
- (2) *Darstellung des Menschen in der älteren griechischen Kunst*, von JULIUS LANGE. Aus dem Dänischen übersetzt von MATHILDE MANN. . . mit einem Vorwort von A. FURTWÄNGLER. Strassburg, 1900. (Heitz & Mündel). 20 M.

THESE two books, published with some eighteen months interval between them, are significant of the attempt which is being made to account for the causes that determine the aesthetic changes noted and, to a certain extent, classified by the historical method. Professor Loewy's book deals mainly with that three-dimensional problem in art, which has so exercised the ingenuity of art-critics since the publication of Hildebrand's masterly essay *Das Problem der Form in der bildenden Kunst*. All progress in the formative arts, whether painting proper, relief, or sculpture in the

round, is a progression from the simple flat presentment of the image to the discovery of how to render the third dimension or depth; at the same time, according to Prof. Loewy, the unconscious resistance offered at all times by the artist to the third-dimensional rendering explains most, or all, of the artistic conventions for which, so far, only partial or unsatisfactory solutions had been found. The primitive artist is unable to grasp more than one view of his subject—hence early painting remains a purely linear art, whether it appear as pure outline or filled in as silhouette. Hence, too, the flatness of early relief, with its incapacity for three-dimensional suggestion and absence of all plastic conception, the lingering effects of what were originally but artistic limitations making themselves still felt in such works as the grave reliefs of Philis and from Pella, and in the frieze of the Parthenon. It is Loewy's application of these theories to sculpture 'in the round' which is most interesting because most novel. The two arts—for relief and painting are inseparable—of painting and sculpture show a parallel development. The early sculptor as little grasps the third-dimensional quality as the early painter. Hence the earliest statues like the 'Nikandra' from Delos are strictly carved only in one view (p. 31); as art progresses, figures are sculptured, so to speak, in relief on their four faces, and though the corner angles are rounded off the figure has no organic depth, a defect acutely noted by Loewy even on so advanced, and in some ways perfect, a figure as the Apollo of Tenea (p. 32). A significant observation which needs insisting upon, is that the process, contrary to what we should expect, is the same for bronze work as for sculpture in stone. That a marble figure carved out of a plane-faced, four-sided block should technically favour the one-view process is obvious; what is not so clear is that the same peculiarities and conditions, based on the same visual limitations, obtain in bronze, where it might be supposed that dependence on the clay model or the mould would tend to make the rectangular structure soon retire before the real round. But original bronze masterpieces such as the Charioteer from Delphi or the Apollo of Piombino are a proof of the contrary; they are on the rectangular plan as much as any marble work of the same period; and in their presence it is impossible, as Loewy points out, to contend that the rectangular character, for example, of the Dresden copies of the 'Lemnian'

Athena, is due to 'schematizing' on the copyist's part; it obviously belonged to the original bronze. As a fact the efflorescence of Greek painting and sculpture took place while art had not yet thoroughly passed out of its linear and rectangular phase. In the statues of Praxiteles linger many traces thereof—and only at the close of the great period, in the art of Lysippos, may these primitive conditions be pronounced as altogether conquered, and the plastic arts to have become in *jedem Sinne körperlich*.

Professor Loewy is an experienced student and exponent of aesthetic theories. Some eight years ago, long before such problems had attained their present vogue it was he who in his treatise on Lysippos (*Lysipp u. seine Stellung in der griechischen Kunst*) first adumbrated the principle which was afterwards independently developed and definitely formulated as the 'frontal law' (*Gesetz der Frontalität*) by the Danish professor Julius Lange. It is a matter for regret that in the German translation of Lange's book before us the discussion of an aesthetic law which, at the time of its publication, was hailed by an eminent reviewer in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* as 'an art-historical result of the first rank, comparable to the discovery of a law of nature,' should appear only in the short French *résumé* that was appended to the Danish edition. Briefly stated, the 'frontal law' postulates that in the primitive sculpture of all peoples, the movement of figures 'in the round' is limited by the fact that whatever the pose, be it standing or sitting, bending forwards or backwards, riding, kneeling, lying on the face or on the back, *there is no lateral divergence from an imaginary axis that divides the body into two exact halves*. The observance of this law it was that imparted to early sculpture a special character, felt and appreciated by critics but hitherto left unexplained. How, in Greek sculpture, the frontal law gradually gives way before greater technical and artistic freedom is shown at length in the two later sections of Lange's work in its German dress. For instance—everyone has doubtless observed how rigid is the pose of the wounded warrior from the eastern pediment of the temple of Aegina, by comparison with that of the 'Ilissos' from the Parthenon. But till Lange pointed it out, and moreover, illustrated his reasoning by diagrams, it was not equally clear that this comparative rigidity is due to the fact that the Aeginetan sculptor, still under the ban of the 'frontal law,' has not understood how to connect the

lower torso with the legs, truthfully to nature, whereas the sculptor of the 'Iliissos' had completely discarded frontality. In standing statues the change from the frontal position took place gradually with the shifting of the weight of the body to the one or the other leg—the great innovation that marks the passage from primitive to perfected sculpture. In the *Discobolus*—for its period a real *tour de force*—the necessities imposed by the frontal law are only imperfectly overcome: hence the unpleasing contortions that called forth the criticism of Quintilian. Consonantly with the modification of posture comes a development in the expressiveness of the face...In a word 'All the changes in the posture of figures, brought about by the transition period, may be summed up by saying that the earlier frontal statue represented an external structure of the human form: upon two feet were placed two legs, above the legs a body, above the body a neck and head and so on—whereas the new statue is a representation of the human being in which everything is evolved from, and imposed by, an inner centre—an Ego.'

One important result of the wider knowledge thus secured by the scientific observation of the whole range of artistic phenomena, is that many a defect or a limitation once considered characteristic of some artist or school, now appears as the natural outcome of the phase reached in the aesthetic development at the period to which the work belongs. In the flat treatment of the 'Stele of two Maidens from Pharsalos' we shall no longer recognise with Brunn, because of the provenance of the stele, a technique wholly peculiar to the schools of Northern Greece (Loewy, p. 20)—any more than we shall attribute the still inaccurate articulation of the Aeginetan figures to the 'deficiencies of certain Aeginetan artists. For had this been the case, we should not have wasted our words upon the matter in this connection' (Lange, p. 71). I have dwelt upon what seemed to me the most characteristic part of Lange's book—but it touches upon a number of interesting subjects—such as the presentation of the figure on the plane surface, and the different level of artistic development reached in representations of animals and in those of the human figure; the author died before he could complete his researches beyond the first period of the efflorescence of Greek art, but he has left us a searching and—considering all that has been written before—an extraordinarily original and fresh examination of the Parthenon marbles, as well as some sound criticism on the Polykleitan school.

(3) S. REINACH: *Le type Féminin de Lysippe* (from *Revue Archéologique*, 1900).

Its seductive title gives all the importance of a monograph to this article. Like M. Reinach, many an archaeologist has been haunted by the idea that among the innumerable still unreclaimed copies of statues in our museums may be concealed female types referable to the Master of the Apoxyomenos, though the same method of recovery would not commend itself to all. In endeavouring to fill the gap, M. Reinach displays, as usual, a subtle power of criticism to which his unrivalled command of aesthetic vocabulary enables him to give the fullest and most telling expression; yet he strikes me as not altogether equal to himself in this his latest effort at attribution—nay, as being in danger of consecrating by his influence methods of research which the many students of his work know that he would have been the first to condemn or to ridicule only a while ago. To say that because Lysippus was a prolific artist, who is known to have made a great number of female statues, copies of these statues must survive, and then to set about to find them (*rechercher le type féminin qu'on est en droit de lui attribuer*) savours of an *a priori* method which obtained too long, and which we hoped was fast vanishing. M. Reinach himself has often taught us to work not from our preconceived notion to some statue which we force to fit it, but honestly—if sometimes wearily—from the statue itself to its school and its master. Be these things as they may, he does not seem to us to have altogether had *la main heureuse* in two, at any rate, of the three works which he here proposes as Lysippian. They are given on Plate xix. on either side of a dainty Praxitelean head at Dresden—originally published by M. Reinach himself—to which they are supposed to offer marked contrasts. The first, which is 'in the market' at Rome, was lately photographed for the *Einzelverkauf* series, and pronounced by Dr. Arndt in the text to the E. V. to be Praxitelean—an opinion which is confirmed rather than otherwise by its present juxtaposition with the Dresden head.<sup>1</sup> The second would be 'Lysippian' head, which belongs to the Hon. Ashley Ponsonby, has for upwards of twenty years been a loan in the South Kensington Museum,<sup>2</sup> where it was noted

<sup>1</sup> The head, which I knew only from the photograph, belongs most probably to a later development of the Praxitelean school.

<sup>2</sup> In saying that he ignores the present whereabouts of the head, M. Reinach's marvellous museographic

by Michaelis (*Ancient Marbles in Great Britain*, p. 484, No. 18). It is in a shocking condition, owing to a mixed coating of brown paint (*vide* Michaelis) and London dirt. The facial oval is long, differing therefore totally from the short, packed Lysippian oval as seen, not only in the Apoxyomenos, but in the fine replica in the British Museum of the 'Lansdowne Hermes' and in other works after Lysippus; the expression has the true Skopasian inwardness, of which the superficial, externalising Lysippus shows himself incapable. Not that I would refer the head to Skopas, the facial forms are reminiscent rather of later developments of his school in the direction perhaps of the Demeter of Knidos.

The third attempt at attribution which, as M. Reinach is careful to remind us, is not altogether novel, is somewhat happier, even if it rest at present on very slight proof. As we see them juxtaposed on Pl. xviii., certainly the head of the larger of the two female draped statues from Herculaneum at Dresden offers analogies to the Apoxyomenos; though the analogy is greatly lessened if we look at the female head poised at the correct angle on the statue itself. This type of head, however, cannot be dissociated from one with which it is far more intimately connected than with the Apoxyomenos, namely from the lovely head in the Glyptothek at Munich (no. 89), and the kindred heads which are linked not only by affinities of style but by their peculiar rolled headdress. M. Reinach now dismisses, or rather ignores, a connection he had himself insisted upon in a previous paper on the 'Corinna' of Seilanian. Full of the idea that the Herculaneum figure is Lysippian and therefore copied from bronze, he pronounces somewhat lightly that the hair is a further proof of bronze origin, since this treatment is peculiarly suitable to bronze technique. But does he forget that among those heads with rolled hair, which he himself had enumerated as 'congénères'<sup>1</sup> in his article on Seilanian, one is the marble head in Munich, certainly one of the most exquisite masterpieces of Greek or of any marble sculpture, where the hair is treated at once with tenderness and the utmost *muestría*. How noble is

memory has for once failed him; the head remains now, as for the last five or six years, where the present writer saw it again only a day or two ago—in an angle of the corridor outside the refreshment room.

<sup>1</sup> These heads clearly fall into groups within a group, though for the present purpose it suffices to consider them as a class. It seems uncertain whether the head on the Compiègne 'Corinna' really belongs to the statue.

the contour it imparts to the brow, yet how lifelike and dainty the delicate indication of the slight pull exerted by the roots of the hair upon the gently swelling temples, how soft and almost 'illusionist' is the ripple of the softly rolled waves. No sculptor or critic would, I think, be found to say that here was technique unsuited to marble. The little marble head from Corfu (Friedrichs-Wolters 1521) equally an original is, as Wolters saw long ago, inseparable from the Munich head. The same coiffure, though somewhat more closely waved or rolled, occurs again on the maid in the grave relief of Archestrates at Leiden; the head of this maid seems intimately connected with the Knidian head; the shape of the eye, and the general cast of the countenance point if not to a common at least to a very closely allied origin. Of marble too, and of the same period, if not of the same school, is the charming original head in high relief with an adaptation of the same headdress published by Professor Gardner (*Journ. Hell. Stud.* xv, 1895, Pl. 6), who not improbably surmises that it may have belonged to the sculptured decoration of the temple of Sunium. When the coiffure in question occurs in no less than four undoubted originals of the fourth century, what becomes of M. Reinach's contention that it is only suited to bronze technique? The fact is that M. Reinach in common with the majority of archaeologists misapprehends, under the influence of modern criticism, the true relation of bronze to marble technique in antiquity. The ancient sculptor aimed at definite optical effects which fluctuated in different periods and schools, but which remained but slightly if at all affected by considerations of material.<sup>2</sup> This is a point which cannot be developed here—but I doubt whether, without the texts to tell them that the original Apoxyomenos was bronze, archaeologists would be so sure that the exquisite lissom modelling of the Vatican statue *produit un effet de sécheresse toute métallique*. And would we have seen traces of marble technique in the hard copy of a female head in Berlin (Cat. No. 610), had not a fortunate discovery given us the marble original (E. Gardner, *Handbook*, Fig. 101)? It is disappointing to find that M. Reinach

<sup>2</sup> Since writing the above I have found a striking confirmation of this view, in the finest of the bronzes recently recovered near Cythera—the life-size Hermes which is justly considered to resemble the Hermes of Olympia. The hair, although bronze, is as loosely modelled with a view to effect by means of alternating light and shadow, as is that of the Olympian statue. In the fifth century, on the other hand, wire-drawn hair is found both in marble and in bronze works.



is content to base his attempt at *rapprochement* of the Herculanean figure to the Apoxyomenos on the evidence of the heads alone, especially as in Lysippian statues, the head—generally of an eclectic type—is by no means the most interesting or characteristic part. It would be satisfactory to know what Lysippian character, if any, he finds in the body of the female figure. The present writer at least sees in it no attempt to solve the problems wherein lay the true greatness and the true innovation of Lysippus and his school. The way in which Lysippus elongates the forms so as to bring out the statal lines is quite beyond anything attempted by his predecessors—even by Praxiteles. In the Apoxyomenos the marvellous rotation of the limbs round the axis of the figure imparts an individual rhythm which is entirely new, which is the secret of its admirable mobility and which we find again in figures such as the 'Eros stringing his Bow,' the 'Hermes' of Lansdowne House, and its replicas (this quality of mobility indeed being that which above all distinguishes the Lysippian figures 'with a raised foot' from other statues with the same external motive such as the Poseidon of the Lateran and the Alexander Rondanini). All this we miss in the figure from Herculaneum; like the simple grace of her pose and the flow of her draperies show that the current Praxitelean attribution is correct. To what master or modification of the Praxitelean school she exactly belongs is of course uncertain for the present.

A small error may be noted on p. 15. The replica found at Aegion of the smaller Herculanean figure was the pendant not to a replica of the 'Antinous Belvedere' but to a variant though kindred type of the Hermes known as of Aegion, a figure modified from some fifth century original (see Bulle in No. 631 and 632 of the E.V.) It is the Hermes found at Andros which is an exact copy of the Belvedere statue, and its feminine pendant was the exquisite replica, now in Athens, of the larger Herculanean statue.

I have ventured to attack the main thesis of a brilliant paper. Space fails me to dwell on minor points, such as *inter alia* the new contention that copies after bronze are more accurate than copies after marble; for of the former a mould can be taken, a process impossible in the case of marble statues by reason of their delicate colouring. This clever theory, however, is not altogether confirmed by a close study of copies. Think for instance of the marble head from the Acropolis mentioned above, and its mechani-

cally accurate copy in Berlin; and many other copies after marble might be cited, so accurate as to make us suspect that casts must have been taken of marble statues also, in spite of their colouring. That the larger Herculanean figure with her companions may be Mnemosyne with two of the Muses is an attractive if not a proven suggestion.

(4) *Strena Helbigiana*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1900.

This book was offered to Professor Helbig for his sixtieth birthday by sixty of his students and friends varying in merit and celebrity from the great Theodor Mommsen to the writer of the present notice. To review the sixty essays which compose the volume is out of the question. For the history of art special interest attaches to the article by Paul Arndt showing that the so-called 'Alcibiades' of the Vatican belongs to the fourth century and has therefore been misnamed; a beautiful head of Helios from Rhodes is published by Botho Graef; L. Milani in an interesting article wishes to push back the original of the Medicean Venus to Praxiteles himself; a statue interpreted as Achilles belonging to the Naples Museum is published by B. Sauer; we welcome a terra-cotta head from Alexandria, published by Th. Schreiber as a portrait of Alexander, owing to its undoubted likeness to the Azara bust; in the exhaustive discussion we miss a reference to the beautiful portrait statuette after Lysippus belonging to His Excellency M. Nelidow, Russian Ambassador in Rome, the head of which, in spite of the small scale, is assuredly one of the most trustworthy portraits of the great king. W. Amelung publishes the interesting though hitherto neglected group of a Satyr riding upon a dolphin (Casino Borghese)—and shows its influence upon similar compositions in the Renaissance.

#### B.—GREEK VASES.

(1) '*Tyrrhenische*' Amphoren: eine Studie zur Geschichte der altattischen Malerei. Von HERMANN THIERSCH (E. A. Seeman, Leipzig).

This excellent monograph deals with a small but difficult class of early Greek vases, once pronounced to be of Italic origin by Brunn and the Munich school, then gradually traced back to Attica and to Attic origins, and since the appearance of Holwerda's exhaustive essay in the *Jahrbuch* for 1890 accepted as 'Corintho-Attic.' Dr. Thiersch sets himself to prove by a searching comparison that the

first member of the double epithet 'Corintho-Attic' must be dropped; then, while maintaining a purely Attic origin for this ware, he prefers to retain for its products (amphoras exclusively) the distinctive, though once so widely misapplied, name of 'Tyrrhenian' which corresponds to the ultimate, if not to the original, region of their provenance. His contention, supported by ample proof, is briefly that these 'Tyrrhenian' amphoras were produced by Attic craftsmen working for Italic export. They mark a short episode not so much in the development as in the decay of Archaic Attic vase painting; their brief history is that of a decadence. Nay further, so closely similar are all the specimens—some eighty in number—preserved to us that Dr. Thiersch has little hesitation in tracing them back not only to one workshop but to *one* painter, whose death, then, would account for the abrupt disappearance of this class of ware. The little book is divided into sections dealing with the epigraphy, the subjects, the rendering of the nude or of the face, the costume, etc. At all points the author displays not only learning but acute understanding of artistic procedure and of the expressive limitations of archaic art. Mythologists should read the discussion of the art-type of the departure of Amphiaraus, as seen on a 'Tyrrhenian' amphora in Florence. The ancient vase painter lays stress on the *paternal* and not on the marital relation of Amphiaraus: the children crowd about him pathetically and try forcibly to keep back their father among them; Amphiaraus is seen endeavouring to free himself from Alkmaion's clinging embrace. If Eriphyle be there at all, it is without her fatal tokens and in a subordinate place among the other women. May it not be, asks Dr. Thiersch, that on the great Corinthian Krater in Berlin, the action of Amphiaraus has been misunderstood? Are not the hands of the children uplifted towards their father—not as generally supposed, to ask for their mother's life, but to pray their father not to forsake them? And further, 'need the hand be raised with murderous intent: may it not merely be the attribute of the warrior departing for the wars?' One is glad to note that Dr. Thiersch traces the mistake to Pausanias' erroneous interpretation of the same scene on the chest of Cypselus. What false notions of the ancient craftsmen or artists' attitude to their subjects may not the servile dependence of our modern mythologists on the pedantic and unscientific *periegete* be responsible for! Dr. Thiersch in his anxiety to be fair occa-

sionally loads his theme with irrelevancies, as for instance when he quotes, though only to discard it, the notion that the quaint fashion in which three men are carrying Polyxena to the sacrifice, horizontally like a log, on a 'Tyrrhenian' amphora in the British Museum, may be a reminiscence of the three companions of Odysseus carrying the beam wherewith to bore the Cyclops' eye on the vase signed by Aristonofos. This ridiculous system of 'typology' is now discarded by all serious scholars. Thus, in the *Strena Helbigiana* noted above, Dr. Bulle, in making known a new Odysseus vase, justly condemns my former theory of a *contaminatio* between the art-types of Odysseus and the Sirens and of Prometheus and the vulture.

#### C.—ROMAN ART.

EDMOND COURBAUD: *Le Bas-Relief Romain à représentations historiques*. (Bibl. des Ecoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome).

I have briefly stated elsewhere—in my preface to the English edition of Wickhoff's *Roman Art*—wherein consists the main value of this careful archaeological compilation. It is certainly an admirable *résumé* of the best that has been done for Roman art during the nineteenth century by the more conservative school of archaeology who insist on the complete dependence of Roman upon Greek art, a view for the rest advocated only lately by so great a connoisseur as Dr. Petersen in his handbook to Rome, where in the survey of the art treasures of Rome the glories of post-Augustan art are summarily dismissed as Hellenistic in character: 'What remains of the artistic decoration of the Forum of Nerva, of the balustrades, of the triumphal arches and columns, corresponds in the main to the Hellenistic art of which the most characteristic extant example is the sculpture from Pergamon.' This is a view which I have done my best to combat by translating a whole book on the subject. I therefore do not propose to enter upon it here. But since reading Dr. von Domaszewski's article in the *Strena Helbigiana* on the reliefs of the statue of Augustus from Prima Porta, it has occurred to me that perhaps some further light might be brought to bear to show that the kindred central reliefs of the 'Ara Pacis' of Augustus (Florence, given as head-piece in *Strena Helbigiana*, p. 171), which M. Courbaud, like Dr. Schreiber, insists on taking to be a copy from an Hellenistic composition, is after all of Augustan date, and that the slab from

Carthage in the Louvre is therefore the later and not the earlier work. In a remark which unfortunately is only made briefly in a footnote von Domascewski shows that the *Tellus* reclining with the two children at the lower edge of the breast-plate of Augustus is not exactly, as hitherto always said, merely the 'earth,' but rather the *Orbis Romanus*, and that accordingly (the suggestion, apparently, is Professor von Duhn's) the two babes are the divine twins. Then may we not suppose that the *Terra Mater* of the Augustan altar also, partakes of the nature of the *Orbis Romanus*, and that the children in this case again are the twins? How appropriate to the altar of the 'Pacis Augustae' would be this impersonation of the universal Roman sway—surrounded as on the breast-plate by the elements that minister to its prosperity. And as a sure sign of what the Romans understood by the allegory, the twins themselves play about the gracious woman. Should this suggestion turn out to be correct, the relief would become stamped with a distinctive Roman mark, and it would be impossible to date the composition earlier than the Augustan Age.

January, 1901.

EUGÉNIE STRONG.

### MARATHON AND VRANA.

The suggestion that Marathon has become Vrana (p. 135) assumes two things: (1) that the accent of *Μαράθωνα* could be transposed to the preceding syllable, *Μαράθωνα*; (2) that one of the unaccented short vowels has been dropped.

But (1) Modern Greek is very tenacious of the place of the ancient accent. The changes (except in one or two dialects, such as Crete) are very few, and indeed I cannot think of any except the class of words ending in *-ia*, which have all become *ia* with the consonantal *g*. Here the principle seems to be the same as in *Μεγάλας*: *Μεγάλεως*, and *εὖος*: *εὖως*, which began in ancient times. And (2) unaccented short syllables are always pronounced with great distinctness, except initial or final short vowels. Lastly, the very syllables in question appear unclipt in the village name *Μαράθoκαρπος* in Samos, derived no doubt from the same plant as the name of Marathon.

It is therefore highly unlikely that Marathon can have become Vrana, and in any case the guess must be rejected if no evidence to support it is forthcoming. It is conceivable, however, that the name may

have suffered some mutilation on the lips of Vlach or Albanian shepherds.

It does not follow, of course, that Vrana does not cover the site of the ancient village.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

### MONTHLY RECORD.

#### ITALY.

*Imola*.—Some fine Roman pavements have been discovered, with excellent designs; one has a pattern of hexagons in red with white centres and lozenges between: another, patterns of intersecting circles with flowers in the centres, in white on a black ground; and a third a somewhat complicated pattern of squares with borders of panels in which are lozenges, surrounded by guilloches and rosettes in circles, etc., all in black and white.<sup>1</sup>

*Todi*.—Remains of a building have come to light which appeared to have been destroyed by a landslide; it contained, besides marble slabs and pavements and a hypocaust, an onyx goblet, and a life-size statue of Greek marble representing a seated goddess (head wanting). The treatment of the drapery recalls the Hera Borghese of the Vatican and a Hera now in the Thermae of Diocletian.<sup>1</sup>

*Naples*.—A marble block has been found with an inscription of the third century after Christ, which shews points of comparison with *C.I.L.* x. 1492. It runs as follows: LAV[.]CELARCH[ISANTI] IMITABILI DEMARCHO | PLVRIMIS AETIAM AT Q[.] | INSIGNIBVS MERITIS | PRAECLARO V[.] FRETORES | EVBOIS VERE DIGNISSIMO. For the obscure magistrate *laueclarchus* see Beloch, *Campanien*, p. 47 and Kaibel, *Inscr. Gr. Sic. u. Ital.* p. 191; for the form—*isanti* cf. the *demarchisanti* of *C.I.L.* x. 1491. *Fretores Eubois* is of course a transliteration of *φρήτορες Εὐβοίς*.<sup>1</sup>

*Pompeii*.—A somewhat pathetic discovery has been made of the corpse of a man buried deep under lava; he had been carrying a bundle which contained the handle of a silver stew-pan (*trulla*?) ornamented with shell-fish, two spoons, two keys, and a silver denarius of Domitian. In the same spot were found 187 copper coins of various dates.<sup>2</sup>

*Rome*.—Further finds have been made on the site of the *Fons Iuturnae*, including a sarcophagus of Proconnesian marble with reliefs of the third century after Christ: along the front a bust of a woman within a *clipeus*, supported by two winged deities; below, two Cupids in a boat, one fishing, flanked by a River-god on the l. and *Tellus* with cornucopia on the right. At either end is a winged Genius; also a boy carrying a stick and basket, and a man beating a tree(?). To this may be added: an archaistic torso of Apollo, a bust of Jupiter, and fragments of a group of the *Dioscuri* leading their horses to the spring, a genuine Greek fifth century work. [A more detailed account of these discoveries was given by Mr. Ashby in the March number of the *C.R.* p. 139.]<sup>3</sup>

Below the pedestal of Maxentius (see *C.R.* 1900, p. 237, 1901, p. 86), among the deposits ranging from the seventh to the first century B.C., has been found a terracotta antefix in the form of a female

<sup>1</sup> *Notizie degli Scavi*, July 1900.

<sup>2</sup> *Athenaeum*, 9 March.

<sup>3</sup> *Notizie degli Scavi*, August 1900

head, of archaic style, with remains of red colour [cf. the series from Capua in the B.M.J.],<sup>3, 4</sup>

On the slope below the arch of Septimius Severus five fragments of a long inscription of the Republican period have come to light, cut on a slab of travertine; there are remains of red paint in the letters, which are ranged in two columns. It appears to be a sort of advertisement for an additional contract for street operations.<sup>5</sup>

A new fragment of the marble plan of Rome has been found near the Basilica Julia. That it is certainly earlier than the plan made by Septimius Severus in 211 is shown by the plan of the Pantheon thereon, which is evidently previous to the reconstruction by Hadrian. It must therefore belong to the plan made in A.D. 73, destroyed by fire in 191 and restored by Severus. It also shows the *Thermae* (TH)ERMAE[AGRI]P[AE] adjoining the Pantheon. In a tunnel now being bored under the Quirinal was found a statue of a magistrate, also torsos of Silvanus and a youth, a fountain-god reclining, an alabaster Ionic capital, and brick stamps from the kilns of Tonneius, as well as a large mosaic pavement of the third century with Christian symbols.<sup>2</sup>

## SICILY.

*Syracuse*.—Dr. Orsi has been investigating the two grottoes of the Scala Greca, and proves that they represent a sanctuary of Artemis. Numerous objects were found in them, especially terracottas, which were nearly all female heads, mostly with the hair in a high knot, some wearing a cap or a *kalathos*. Besides these may be mentioned a torso of Artemis with bow, and other torsos clearly representing the same goddess, sometimes with a palm tree in the background; also figures of Artemis accompanied by a lion, kid, or deer (*Πόρνια θηρών*), and others with lance, axe, or torch. All seem to be of rather late date.<sup>3</sup>

*Gela*.—In a building known as the Heroön of Antiphemos has been found a cup of Attic make with archaic *graffito* inscriptions: ΜΝΑΣΙΘΑΥΕΞ ΑΝΕΘΕΚΕ ΑΝΤΙΦΑΜΟΙ. The Θ is rhomboidal in form. The name of Mnasiathales seems to connect the inscription with Orchomenos in Boeotia; Antiphemos was the Rhodian *οικιστής* of Gela (see Pauly-Wissowa, s.v.). Also a fragment of a large r.f. kotyle inscribed with the names of Harmodios (. . . ΟΔΙΟΣ and Hipparchos (ΙΠΠ . . . ΧΟΣ), clearly from a representation of the well-known subject (cf. *Arch.-epigr. Mitth. aus Oesterr.* iii. pl. 6, and *Arch. Zeit.* 1883 pl. 12). The action of Harmodios corresponds closely to the vase published in the *Arch. Zeit.*, and also to the famous group in Naples.<sup>1</sup>

## GREECE.

*Kythira*.—The important discovery of a series of Greek statues dredged up by sponge-divers off the island of Kythira (Cerigo), or more strictly speaking off Antikythera, is now a matter of history, and probably familiar to most readers of the *C.R.* It may however be worth while to insert a brief record of the finds here. It is evident that they went down in a vessel which was conveying to Italy the spoils carried off by some Roman general from Greece and foundered while rounding Cape Malea. Portions of the fittings and furniture of the ship were found, as well as objects which had been used by the sailors. It seems highly probable that the general in question

was Sulla, as we know from Lucian (*Zenais*, 3) that one of his ships was wrecked in this way.

The statues and fragments have been brought to Athens, and are now at the Ministry of Public Instruction; they number in all five bronzes and eight marble figures, together with sundry fragments. The bronzes in particular are much corroded by the salt water. Photographs of the most important will be shortly published in the *Hellenic Journal* by the kindness of M. Kavvadias.

(1) Bronze life-size male figure, of which the upper part is well preserved, the rest only in fragments, resembling in general characteristics the *Hermes* of Praxiteles, but more probably from the school of Lysippos. The figure is poised on the left foot, the right hand extended with the fingers downwards, an action the object of which is at present disputed; the best suggestion seems to be that he is aiming at an object with a ball.

(2) Two smaller bronze figures of athletes, practically perfect; both are of the muscular type of the Argive and Sicyonian schools. The larger resembles the *Idolino* of the Uffizi, and is of the latter half of the fifth century; it is interesting to notice that the lips are wanting, and had been supplied in another material and colour. The other is smaller and is also Polycleitan in type, recalling the pose of the *Doryphoros*, but is of later date. It may be compared with the Payne-Knight *Hermes* in the British Museum (*Cat.* 825).

(3) Draped bronze figure of the fifth century; feet and part of head wanting.

(4) Head and arm of bronze boxer with truculent expression, bushy hair, and disfigured nose, wearing the caestus on his forearm.

(5) Crouching figure in marble, bending on the right knee and gazing forward keenly, with the right arm preparing to deliver a blow, while the left is raised on guard. Probably a panceratiast awaiting his adversary's onslaught; the style is that of the Rhodian school (beginning of second century B.C.) and recalls with its realism the British Museum group of boys quarrelling over a game of knucklebones.

(6) Six marble statues much corroded, and torso of large marble Centaur.

(7) Various detached fragments (hands, feet, &c.).<sup>5</sup>

A later telegram speaks of the finding of four more marble statues, badly damaged, one being a colossal figure of *Herakles* like that in the Naples Museum (by Glykon?).<sup>6</sup>

*Mycenae*.—M. Tsountas has found two plain rectangular graves to the south of the treasury of Atreus, containing numerous objects: two alabaster vases, two stone candelabra, a sword-handle, and sundry small ornaments in glass; objects in gold, including twelve figures of birds, butterflies, the nautilus, and models of *oinochoae*; a bronze knife and spear-heads; and four gems, with a lion and human figures as subjects.<sup>7</sup>

## ASIA MINOR.

*Konieh* (Iconium). A huge sarcophagus of marble has come to light, sculptured with hunting and battle scenes like the famous one of Alexander the Great from Sidon. On the alternate sides are groups of people carrying dishes of fruit, groups of children, etc., and on the roof, a man of sorrowful aspect and a woman.<sup>7</sup>

H. B. WALTERS.

<sup>5</sup> *Times*, February 26; *Athenaeum*, March 9; see also *Λογ.*, January 30 (old style), 1901.

<sup>6</sup> *Standard*, March 4.

<sup>7</sup> *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, February 16.

<sup>4</sup> *Athenaeum*, 9 February.